GREAT AGES OF INDIAN HISTORY

THE AGE OF THE SĀTAVĀHANAS

Edited by

AJAY MITRA SHASTRI

Vol. I

ARYAN BOOKS INTERNATIONAL
NEW DELHI

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

DS451
A535
v.1

THE AGE OF THE SĀTAVĀHANAS

Published in 1999 by
ARYAN BOOKS INTERNATIONAL
4378/4B, Pooja Apartments
Ansari Road, Daryaganj
New Delhi-110 002, INDIA

Copyright © 1999
Ajay Mitra Shastri

ISBN 81-7305-157-7 (Vol. I)
81-7305-159-3 (set)

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, utilised in any form or by any means, electronic and mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing from the publishers.

Laser Typeset at S.P. Printech, Delhi-110 092.
Printed in India at Print Perfect, New Delhi.

To My Esteemed Friends

Professors Sadashiv Ambadas Dange

and

(Smt.) Sindhu S. Dange

Formerly R.G. Bhandarkar Professors and

Heads of the Department of Sanskrit,

University of Bombay,

And Erudite Vedic and Sanskrit Scholars

As a Token of Abiding Friendship.

— *Editor*

Contents

	Pages
Preface	xi
List of Illustrations	xiii
Abbreviations	xv
Contributors and Participants	xix

Vol. I

HISTORY

1. Purāṇas on the Sātavāhanas: An Archaeological-Historical Prespective — *Ajay Mitra Shastri* 3
2. Simuka was the Son of Sātakarṇi — *P.V. Parabrahma Sastry* 73
3. The Sātavāhanas in Literature — *(Late) S.B. Deo* 81
4. Greek and Latin Texts on the Andhras — *B.N. Mukherjee* 93
5. The Sātavāhana Epoch: An Ecological Perspective — *M.K. Dhavalikar* 102
6. Sātavāhana: Sāta-Vāz and Vāja-Sāti — *V.S. Pathak* 115
7. Suitability of Paiṭhan as Capital of the Sātavāhanas — *D.N. Sinha* 119
8. The Sātavāhanas and the Coastal Āndhradeśa : A Chronological Study — *V. Sundara Rama Sastry* 127
9. The Sātavāhanas and the Chaṅkam Age — *Raju Kalidos* 144

CULTURAL STUDIES

10. Urban Settlements in the Deccan and Sātavāhana History — *Aloka Parashar-Sen* 159

11. Commerce of Jammū under the Kushāṇas—Possibility of Sātavāhana Context Analysed — *(Late) Y.B. Singh* 190

12. Early Buddhist Monachism and its Socio-Economic Implications — *Himanshu Prabha Ray* 199

13. Hāla and Nāgārjuna — *S.V. Sohoni* 205

14. Guṇāḍhya and his Bṛihatkathā — *Brahmanand Deshpande* 209

Vol. II

NUMISMATICS AND EPIGRAPHY

15. Sātavāhana Coins in Archeological Excavations — *Parmeshwari Lal Gupta* 223

16. Sātavāhana Coinage: Origins and Influences — *Shobhana Gokhale* 278

17. Sātavāhana Coins from Veerāpuram and Vaḍḍamānu Excavations — *M. Veerender and G. Maheshwari* 287

18. Bearing of the Numismatic Evidence on the Purāṇic Sequence of the Sātavāhana Kings — *Amiteshwar Jha* 295

19. A Hoard of Miniature Copper Coins from Amarāvatī — *P.R.K. Prasad* 312

20. Pre-Sātavāhana Phase at Amarāvatī-Dharaṇikoṭa — *P.R.K. Prasad* 327

21. New Evidences on the Early Sātavāhana Coinage, Culture and Commerce — *I.K. Sarma* 341

22. Ceramic Seriation and Chronology of Early Sātavāhana Coins — *Sunil Gupta* 349

23. Coins of the Feudatories and Contemporaries of the Sātavāhanas — *S.J. Mangalam* 360

24. Pitalkhorā Inscriptions : A Reappraisal — *S.K. Mittra* 391

25. Administrative Divisions and Place-Names from Sātavāhana Inscriptions found in Maharashtra : A Case Study — *Malati Mahajan* 400

ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY

26. Forts of the Sātavāhana Times — *H.N. Singh* 421

27. Ports of the Sātavāhana Period — *K.P. Rao* 445

28. Sātavāhana Antiquities from Aḍam — *Amarendra Nath* 460

29. Structural Temples under the Sātavāhanas — *G.B. Deglurkar* 467

30. Sātavāhana Terracotta Art : With Special Reference to Ter — *M.N. Deshpande* 471

31. A Sātavāhana Ivory Comb Found in Hungary — *Parmeshwari Lal Gupta* 480

Preface

If one were asked as to which dynasty played the most pivotal role in the formation and development of the general life and culture of the Deccan and South India in early phases and contributed to develop the region into a well-knit political entity, the unanimous answer would undoubtedly credit these significant achievements to the Sātavāhanas called Andhra or Adhra-jātīya in the dynastic sections of the Purāṇas. And as we have no dependable written account of the dynasty, total uncertainty reigns supreme its chequered annals. The nature of the extant evidence is such as to occasion an unending debate even about such basic issues as the correct nomenclature, the epoch of its political authority, total duration of its rule and the number of rulers, the region where it launched itself on its political career, the order of succession and even actual identity of some of the members, not to speak of comparatively minor problems such as correct forms of individual names and regnal periods of a few of its members much of which is accentuated by the highly defective manuscript tradition which has totally vitiated what otherwise would have formed the rock-solid base of its history. And in the absence of trustworthy written sources, the history of the Sātavāhanas, like that of most other ruling families of early India, has to be reconstructed from an integral study and interpretation of the oncoming data as they surface from time to time, and thus our historical knowledge has to keep growing with the passage of time. It is therefore imperative to take stock of the new material periodically. It was with this object that in 1970 Nagpur University's Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology hosted a national dialogue on the Sātavāhana coinage and again after a lapse of twenty-four years, to be exact on 26-28 February, 1994 (last three days of my formal association with the University) another seminar on the Sātavāhanas with a wider perspective encompassing all the problems and with many more scholars contributing to it. And the seminar was a great success as would be evident even from a cursory glance at the contents of the present volume embodying the results of its deliberations. It would reveal how richer our information about the Sātavāhanas is and how nearer we are to the final answer to some of the relevant problems as compared to some two decades back. In the light of the new information it has been possible to reassess the data known earlier.

Unfortunately, two of the contributors, Professors S. B. Deo and Y.B. Singh, have

passed away recently and could not see their valuable papers published. We take this opportunity to pay our homage to them.

We have received precious help in the preparation of this volume from several quarters, and it is our pleasant duty to acknowledge the same. First and foremost, we are grateful to the learned scholars who willingly responded to our invitation and participated in the seminar and contributed to the success of our venture. Some of them could not attend the seminar personally due to some unforeseen reasons but were good enough to contribute their papers for publication. We are thankful to the University Grants Commission but for whose munificent grant it would not have been possible to hold the seminar.

In the organisation of the seminar our distinguished colleagues Drs. Chandrashekhar Gupta and I. Kellellu were of immense help. The duo extended voluntary help in the publication of this volume also, the first by arranging the illustrations and finalising certain other preliminary matters, and both helped us in going through the proofs.

Shri Vikas Arya, the enterprising proprietor of Aryan Books International, New Delhi, deserves our appreciation and sincere thanks for taking keen enlightened interest in the publication of the present volume.

If this volume generates scholarly interest in the history of the Sātavāhanas with all its varied facets and takes us some steps further in solving some of the relevant issues, we shall deem our efforts amply rewarded.

'*Prachi*'
23, Vidya Vihar, Rana Pratap Nagar
Nagpur-440 022

Ajay Mitra Shastri

List of Illustrations

I. Coins of Samagopa (1), Sātavāhana (2-4).

II. Coins of Sātakarṇi (5-6) and Chhimuka Sātavāhana.

III. Stone Jar from Junnar.

IV. Sātavāhana Coins (1-3).

V. Terracotta Mould (4) and impressions (5) for Coins of Yajña Satakarni; Silver Coin of Yajña Sātakarṇi.

VI. Coins of Sātakarṇi (7), Nahapāna (8), Lead Coin of Sātakarṇi (9).

VII. Copper Coins of Kochhiputa Sātakarṇi (10-12), Horse Type Coin of Sātakarṇi.

VIII. Horse Type Lead Coin of Yajña Sātakarṇi (14); Lion Type Coins of Sātakarṇi (15) and Sātavāhana (16).

IX. Lion Type Coin of Nahapāna (17), Isamahisa (18) and Sātakarṇi (19).

X. Bull Type Coin of Sātakarṇi (20); Ship Type Coin of Yajña Sātakarṇi (21); Coin of Nahapāna (22).

XI. Coin of Nahapāna (23); Restruck Sātavāhana Coins (24-25); Potin Coin of Rudrashimha I (26).

XII-XVII. Sātavāhana Coins (1-44).

XVIII. A Hoard of Minute Copper Coins (1); Different Shapes of Coins in the Hoard (2).

XIX. Varieties in the Hoard (A); Forms of Lion Symbol (B); Line-drawing of the Signet Ring-stone (C).

XX-XXII. Obverse and Reverse Sides of Coins (1-24).

XXIII. Coins of Sada (1), Mahāsada (2) and Aśoka Sada (3).

XXIV. Coins of Śiva Sada (4-5).

XXV. Coins of Śiva Sada (6); Śivamaka Sada (7); Signet Ring-stone from Dharaṇikoṭa Excavation (8).

XXVI. Line-drawings of Sada Coins (1-8).

XXVII-XXVIII. Coins of the Feudatories and Contemporaries of the Sātavāhanas.

XXIX-XXX. Pitalkhorā Inscriptions.

XXXI-XXXIV. Sātavāhana Forts (Sātanikoṭa).

XXXV. Chinese Stamped Pottery, Koṭṭapaṭnam.

XXXVI. Brick Jetty, Kāveripaṭṭanam.

XXXVII. Wooden Poles, Kāveripaṭṭanam.

XXXVIII. Aḍam: Asaka Janapada sealing.

XXXIX. Aḍam: Terracotta figurines.

XL. Aḍam: Etched Bead.

XLI. Treacotta suspension lamp.

XLII. Terracotta figurine of a lady from Ter.

XLIII. Terracotta lid with a lion hunting a deer, from Ter.

XLIV. Terracotta figurine depicting a marine deity, from Ter.

XLV. Terracotta figurines from Ter.

XLVI. Fragment of a terracotta bowl from Ter.

XLVII. Ivory Comb from Hungary– (a) Photographs, (b) Line - drawings.

Abbreviations

ABORI	:	*Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.*
AI	:	*Ancient India.*
AIU	:	*The Age of Imperial Unity* edited by R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalkar.
ARAP	:	*Annual Reports, Government of Andhra Pradesh.*
ARDAM	:	*Annual Report of the Department of Archaeology and Museums,* Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.
ASI,AR	:	*Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports.*
ASWI	:	*Archaeological Survey of Western India.*
AV	:	*The Age of the Vākāṭakas* edited by Ajay Mitra Shastri.
CAI	:	*The Classical Accounts of India* edited by R.C. Majumdar.
CASR	:	Cunningham's *Archaeological Survey Reports.*
CHI	:	*A Comprehensive History of India.*
CHMG	:	*Cultural History of Maharashtra and Goa from Place-Names found in Inscriptions* by Malati Mahajan.
CII	:	*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.*
DKA	:	*The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* by F.E. Pargiter.
EA	:	*Epigraphia Andhrica.*
EHAC	:	*Early History of the Andhra Country* by K. Gopalachari.
EHD	:	*Early History of the Dekkhan* by R.G. Bhandarkar.
EHDPP	:	*Early History of the Deccan: Problems and Perspectives* by Ajay Mitra Shastri.
EHDY	:	*Early History of the Deccan* edited by G. Yazdani.
EI	:	*Epigraphia Indica.*

GS : *Gāthasaptaśatī of Hāla Sātavāhana.*

HCIP : *The History and Culture of the Indian People* edited by R.C. Majumdar.

HDS : *History of Dharmaśāstra* by P.V. Kane.

HISWK : *History and Inscriptions of the Sātavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas* by V.V. Mirashi.

IA : *Indian Antiquary.*

IAR : *Indian Archaeology – A Review.*

IESHR : *Indian Economic and Social History Review.*

IHR : *The Indian Historical Review.*

ISBV : *India as seen in the Brhatsaṁhitā of Varāhamihira* by Ajay Mitra Shastri.

JA : *Journal Asiatique.*

JAAP : *Journal of Archaeology : Andhra Pradesh.*

JASB : *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.*

JBBRAS : *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

JESHO : *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.*

JESI : *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India.*

JIH : *Journal of Indian History.*

JNSI : *Journal of the Numismati Society of India.*

JOI : *Journal of the Oriental Institute.*

JRAS : *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

LL : H. Lüders, ''A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the exception of those of Aśoka,'' Appendix to *EI*, X.

MASI : *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India.*

ND : *Numismatic Digest.*

NHIP : *A New History of the Indian People.*

NS : *Numismatic Studies.*

NSVK	:	*Nāmādi-Śabda-Vyutpatti-Kośa* (Marathi) by V.K. Rajwade.
PAPHC	:	*Proceedings of the Andhra Pradesh History Congress.*
PBSK	:	*Prāchīna Bhāratīya Sthala-Kośa* (Marathi) by Siddheshwara Shastri Chitrav.
PIHC	:	*Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.*
QSR	:	*Quaternary Science Review.*
SED	:	*Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Monier Monier-Williams.
SGAMI	:	*Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Mediaeval India* by D.C. Sircar.
SI	:	*Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization* by D.C. Sircar.
SMHD	:	*Sources of the Medieaval History of the Deccan (Dakshinachyā Madhyayugīna Itihāsāchī Sādhane-Marathi)* by G.H. Khare.
SPIKL	:	*Sātavāhana āṇi Paśchimī Kshatrapa yāṁchā Itihāsa āṇi Korīva Lekha* (Marathi) by V.V. Mirashi.
SRIKL	:	*Śilāhāra Rājavaṁśāchā Itihāsa āṇi Korīva Lekha* (Marathi) by V.V. Mirashi.
SSIC	:	*Studies in South Indian Coins.*
SWKHF	:	*The Sāthavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas : A Historical Frame-work* by Ajay Mitra Shastri.
VI	:	*Varāhamihira's India* by Ajay Mitra Shastri.
ZDMG	:	*Zeischrift der Deutschen Morgenlandische Gesellschaft*, Leipzig.

Contributors and Participants

Dr. G.B. Deglurkar
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Deccan College
PUNE - 411 006

(Late) Professor S.B. Deo
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Deccan College
PUNE - 411 006

Dr. Brahmanand Deshpande
Department of History
Saraswati Bhuvan College
AURANGABAD

Professor M.K. Dhavalikar
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Deccan College
PUNE - 411 006

Dr. Shobhana Gokhale
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Deccan College
PUNE - 411 006

Dr. Chandrashekhar Gupta
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Nagpur University
NAGPUR - 440 010

Dr. Parmeshwarilal Gupta
Indian Institute of Research in Numismatic Studies
Anjaneri
NASIK - 422 213

Shri Sunil Gupta
Allahabad Museum
ALLAHABAD - 211 002

Shri Amiteshwar Jha
Indian Institute of Research in Numismatic Studies
Anjaneri
NASIK - 422 213

Professor Raju Kalidos
Department of Art
Tamil University
TANJAVUR - 613 005

Dr. Ismail Kellellu
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Nagpur University
NAGPUR - 440 010

Mrs. G. Maheshwari
Birla Archaeological and Cultural Research Institute
Malakpet
HYDERABAD - 500 036

Dr. Malati M. Mahajan
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Nagpur University
NAGPUR - 411 010

Dr. G.K. Mane
Yeshwant Mahavidyalaya
Wardha

Dr. S.J. Mangalam
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Deccan College
PUNE - 411 006

Dr. P.S. Meshram
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Nagpur University
NAGPUR - 411 010

Shri S.K. Mittra
Archaeological Survey of India
NAGPUR

Professor B.N. Mukherjee
Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture
University of Calcutta
CALCUTTA - 700 019

Dr. Amarendra Nath
Archaeological Survey of India
NEW DELHI - 110 001

Dr. S.K. Pandey
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
H.S. Gour University
SAGAR - 470 004

Dr. Aloka Parashar-Sen
Department of History
University of Hyderabad
HYDERABAD - 500 134

Professor V.S. Pathak
Vice-Chancellor
Gorakhpur University
GORAKHPUR

Dr. P.R.K. Prasad
Formerly Archaeological Survey of India
Puranam House, Station Road
TENALI - 522 202

Dr. K.P. Rao
Department of Ancient Indian History
Shri Venkateswara University
TIRUPATI - 517 502

Dr. Himanshu Prabha Ray
School of Historical Studies
NEW DELHI

Dr. I.K. Sarma
Salarjung Museum
HYDERABAD - 500 002

Dr. P.V. Parabrahma Sastry
(Formerly Dy. Director, Directorate of Archaeology and Museums,
Govt. of Andhra Pradesh)
2-1-514/A, Nallakunta
HYDERABAD - 500 044

Dr. V. Sundara Rama Sastry
Department of History,
Nagarjuna University
GUNTUR - 622 910

Professor Ajay Mitra Shastri
Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology
Nagpur University
NAGPUR - 440 010

Dr. Gopal Shesh
Quila Ward
BILASPUR

Dr. H.N. Singh
Archaeological Survey of India
NEW DELHI

(Late) Professor Y.B. Singh
Department of History
University of Jammu,
JAMMU TAWI

Shri D.N. Sinha
Archaeological Survey of India
AURANGABAD

Dr. S.V. Sohoni
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
PUNE - 411 004

Dr. A. Veluswamy Suthinthiran
Department of Art
Tamil University
TANJAVUR - 613 005

Shri M. Veerender
Birla Archaeological and Cultural Research Institute
Malakpet
HYDERABAD - 500 036

HISTORY

1

Purāṇas on the Sātavāhanas : An Archaeological-Historical Perspective

AJAY MITRA SHASTRI

The Sātavāhanas were the earliest known autochthonous ruling family of the Deccan and ruled over an extensive empire for a little less than three centuries uninterruptedly with varying vicissitudes of fortune like no other dynasty had done before them. The general peace over this long period provided conditions for economic prosperity resulting from brisk agricultural operations and bringing hitherto untapped areas under cultivation, growth of crafts and industries and booming internal and external land and maritime trade with the balance of trade favourable to Indians. This affluence in turn aided artistic and literary efflorescence the fruits of which can be perceived in the large number of Hīnayāna Buddhist rock-hewn monasteries and chapels decked with sculptures and paintings in the Sahyādri ranges and rich Prakrit literature. Truly the period in question was the classical age in the early Deccanese history.

However, the history of such a glorious epoch is enveloped in great uncertainty due to lack of dependable sources, and there is no unanimity even about such basic issues as the original centre of the dynasty's power and the period of its emergence and the total number of its kings and the duration of their rule, not to speak of such comparatively minor details as spellings of individual names and the extent of reigns. This uncertainty is further aggravated by historians' prejudices. However, it is still possible to arrive at almost final conclusions in these and other matters by a careful, comparative and dispassionate analysis of even this undependable material.

The sources available to the historian include a fairly large number of inscriptions (now thirty-five), either of the Sātavāhana kings themselves or of private individuals but mentioning them as well as those of their contemporaries, viz. the Kshaharātas and the Kārdamakas, an

extensive series of base metal coins and a comparatively smaller volume of white metal specie and literary sources. Of the literary material, the historical sections of the Purāṇas are the most valuable notwithstanding their drawbacks like variant readings often in such vital matters as the personal names of the rulers and the duration of their rule. Even though the dynastic accounts (*vaṁś-ānucharita*) form one of the major constituents of the Purāṇas according to a traditional definition, they are not found in all the Purāṇa texts, and only five of the major Purāṇas, viz. *Matsya*, *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata*, contain details about the Sātavāhanas who are called Andhras.[1] They give only the total number and duration of the rule of these kings who are mentioned by name often with their regnal period in a prophetic manner, but obviously the kings had flourished, in most cases, earlier than the relevant accounts were composed. We get only their names without any reference whatever to the events of their reigns except only in the case of the founder of the dynasty. And the value of these narrations is still further impaired by numerous variant readings resulting from defective manuscript tradition which gave rise often to unintelligent and meaningless variations, sometimes in such vital matters as proper names and the duration of reigns of not only individual rulers but also of the dynasty as a whole. But it is still possible to elicit some vital information about different problems and make them meaningful with the help of other evidences, and the same is attempted in the following pages within obvious limitations.

I

ORIGINAL HOME AND NOMENCLATURE

The dynasty as a whole is called Andhra or Āndhra[1a] and its first king or founder, whose name is spelt variously in different Purāṇa manuscripts,[2] is described as Andhra or Andhra-jātīya.[3] As against this, the inscriptions often refer to the family as Sādavāhana-kula,[4] or Sātavāhana-kula[5] or simply the Sātavāhanas.[6] They are never called Sātavāhanas or by any similar name in the Purāṇas nor do inscriptions ever refer to the nomenclature Andhra or Andhra-jātīya. However, the sameness of the two is established beyond any shadow of doubt by the identity of the names of individual rulers.[7] These apparently conflicting traditions regarding the dynasty have resulted in a protracted controversy about its original home and nomenclature. In accordance with the Purāṇic tradition and considering the present habitat of the Andhras and the generally accepted connotation of the name Andhradeśa, earlier writers on the Sātavāhanas held that the dynasty first rose to power in the Andhradeśa which was by common consensus taken to denote the Kṛishṇā-Godāvarī region of Andhra Pradesh.[8] This was, for example, the view of Vincent A. Smith who held that the kingdom of the founder of the dynasty, Simuka, included the delta of the rivers Kṛishṇā and Godāvarī with Śrīkākulam situated on the lower course of the former as his metropolis.[9] E.J. Rapson concurred with Smith but added that at the time of their incursion into Vidarbha the Andhras had extended their authority across the Deccan from the eastern coast.[10] L.D.

Barnett thought that Śrīkākulam was the earliest capital followed in turn by Dhanakaṭaka (modern Dharanikoṭa, near Amarāvatī) in the Guṇṭūr district of Andhra Pradesh and Pratishṭhāna (modern Paiṭhan) in the Auraṅgābād district of Maharashtra.[11] He further observed that the Sātavāhana or Sātakarṇi dynasty ruled over the Telugu country.[12] It was held by R.G. Bhandarkar that the Sātavāhanas had two capitals, the senior ruler who was treated as the lord of the whole empire had his capital at Dhanakaṭaka[13] and the junior king ruled from the secondary capital at Pratishṭhāna.[14] In the opinion of Jas Burgess the earliest Andhra capital was at Śrīkākulam which was traditionally believed to have been founded by a great emperor called Sumati whom he proposed to identify with the first Andhra-Sātavāhana king Simuka.[15] D.R. Bhandarkar[16] and Gurty Venkat Rao[17] held that the original home of the Andhra-Sātavāhanas included the southern parts of the old Central Provinces together with the Vishākhapaṭnam district and perhaps the Godāvarī and Krishna districts. The Andhra original home theory was favoured by a number of scholars including O. Ramachandraiya[18] in a general way without adducing additional arguments.

However, the above theory is opposed to the facts that almost all the early Sātavāhana records were then reported from northern Maharashtra (Nāsik-Pune region) only and the dynasty is nowhere spoken of as Andhra in the fairly numerous inscriptions of its members. Therefore numerous scholars are of the view that the Sātavāhanas began their career in Maharashtra and it was only after Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi that they extended their authority over Andhradeśa and in consequence came to be called Andhras. And as just before the period of the compilation of the dynastic accounts of the Purāṇas their power was restricted to Andhradeśa, these compilers were aware of them only as an Andhra power and referred to them as Andhra or Andhra-jātīya. This was the opinion of V.S. Bakhle,[19] A.S. Altekar,[20] V.V. Mirashi[21] and H.C. Raychaudhuri.[22] K. Gopalachari tried to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between the Purāṇic tradition and the statements encountered in the inscriptions of the dynasty in a rather strange way. He first observes that all the early extant epigraphic and numismatic evidences prove unambiguously not only that the centre of gravity of the early Sātavāhanas proper lay in the Western Deccan but also that the early Sātavāhanas did not rule over Andhradeśa.[23] Next with the object of reconciling this view with the description of the Sātavāhanas as Andhra and Andhra-jātīya in the Purāṇas he resorts to the rather strange surmise that in the days of tribulation and a rather obscure existence under their Maurya suzerains to whom they were compelled to submit, the scions of the royal family of Andhradeśa might have passed into the service of the Maurya kings and in that capacity may have gone to the Western Deccan as viceroys of the Mauryas and thereby got the Purāṇic appellation Andhra-jātīya.[24]

All these theories, however, lack essential support from the extant evidence which only needs to be properly interpreted dispassionately if we have to arrive at a conclusion which would reconcile both the literary and archaeological evidences. First, if the find of inscriptions

and other records[25] of a dynasty were to be taken as the sole criterion for the inclusion of a particular territory under its rule, the Marāṭhwāḍā and the Vidarbha regions have also not yielded any dependable Sātavāhana record, at least for the early period, and consequently would have to be excluded from the dominion of the early Sātavāhanas which would then be confined only to the Nāsik-Nāṇeghāṭ (Puṇe) region. Secondly, the extant evidence does not support the accusation against the compilers of the historical sections of the Purāṇas that they were ignorant of historical facts and fabricated the Andhra origin just because the Sātavāhana rule was restricted to Andhradeśa during the closing years of the dynasty. Even granting for arguments sake that later Sātavāhanas had lost Maharashtra and their power was confined to Andhradeśa,[26] there is definite evidence that at least the *Matsya* account up to Yajña Sātakarṇi was composed (or compiled) during his own reign. For, though the Paurāṇic accounts are generally in the form of prophetic statements, in the instant case it is in the present tense and the king is stated to have been ruling in the ninth year of his reign: *nava varshāṇi Yajñaśrīḥ kurute Śātakarṇikaḥ*.[27] This would prove that the Purāṇic account was at first concluded in the ninth year of Yajña in whose time there could be absolutely no question of the Sātavāhana rule being restricted to Andhradeśa, for his inscriptions and coins have been reported in numbers from Maharashtra. Thirdly, we have shown elsewhere[28] that it was not Andhradeśa, but Vidarbha, that was the latest centre where the Sātavāhanas continued to exercise power for some seven odd decades after their rule over other regions had ended, and therefore if the compilers of the relevant Purāṇic accounts were in a position to name the dynasty only after the region under its control during the later period alone, they would have better designated it as Vaidarbha, not Andhra. Fourthly, as early as the time of the third member of the dynasty, viz. Sātakarṇi,[29] the Sātavāhanas were already styled *Dakshiṇāpatha-pati* or 'lords of Dakshiṇāpatha'[30] or the Deccan, which denoted in a wider sense the entire South India except only the Tamil country. Sometimes the name Dakshiṇāpatha is taken to connote only Maharashtra or Western Deccan,[31] and it may have been so in a narrow sense in ancient times too; but there is absolutely nothing to prove that it is employed in this restricted sense in the present case. The anonymous author of the *Periplus maris Erythraei* (better known to Indian historians as *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*), who definitely wrote his work in the early Sātavāhana period, also employs the name Dachinabades (Dakshiṇāpatha) in the wider sense and distinguishes it from Limyrika or the Tamil country.[32] If we were to believe that the Telugu country came to be included in the Sātavāhana dominions only from the time of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi as some scholars hold,[33] it will be difficult to explain his father Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi's claim that his charges drank the waters of the three oceans (*ti-samuda-toya-pīta-vāhanasa*)[34] even though it is used here in a vague exaggerated manner. Fifthly, while earlier no archaeological evidence of the Sātavāhana connection with the Telugu country was available, in recent years quite a lot of coins of Chhimuka or Simuka, the founder of the dynasty, as well as those of some other early members of the dynasty have been found from Koṭaliṅgāla[35] and Sangareḍḍy[36] in the

Karīmnagar district of Andhra Pradesh which should leave no doubt whatever regarding the incorporation of this region in the Sātavāhana kingdom from the very beginning. We are firmly convinced that even coins with the name of Sātavāhana as issuer must also be attributed to him. Then, a coin of the Sātavāhana prince Śaktikumāra belonging to the fourth generation of the founder has been reported in a stratified context in the excavations at Sātānikoṭa in the Kurnool district of Andhra Pradesh.[37] Then there is at least one very popular name among the Sātavāhanas, Pulumāvi,[38] also spelt as Puḷumāvi, Pudumāvi, Puḷahāmavi and Pulumāyi,[39] which is explicable only in Telugu. It actually comprises two words, *pulu + māvi. Pulu* in Telugu means 'grass' which is still in vogue and with it we have the compound word *pullari* meaning grazing tax. *Māvi* means the soft thin covering where the baby lies in mother's womb before its birth. It is well known that god Skanda took his birth through a grass cover which resulted in his being known as Śarajanman. So Pulumāvi is the Telugu rendering of Sanskrit Śara-janman or, in other words, the name of Skanda-Kārttikeya.[40] It was originally a Telugu name and as such the Purāṇa compilers were unable to follow it and never in a position to spell it correctly. Consequently it has been corrupted severally into the forms like Pulomāvi,[41] Pulomāvid, Sulomavir, Padumāvir, Paṭumāvir, Patramātir, Shaṭumāvir, Shaḍumāvir, Shadramāvi, Padumān, Paṭumān, Padhumān, Vaṭamāna, Aṭamāna, Athamāna, Aṁḍamāna, Aramāna, Rachamāna,[42] Pulomā,[43] Sulomā, Pulimān, Kulimān, Purīmān, Purimān, Putrīmān,[44] Pulomāchi, Pulomarchi, Pulomādi, Anulomāvi, Salomādhi, Malomadhi,[45] etc. All these variants, which are much more numerous than for any other name, serve to illustrate the enormous inconvenience experienced by the Purāṇic composers in Sanskritising this purely Telugu name.[46] Eighthly, when the Sātavāhanas decided to issue silver portrait coins with bilingual legends towards the close of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi's reign[47] or early in the reign of his son and successor Vāsishthīputra Puḷumāvi,[48] for the reverse legend their choice fell on the undifferentiated Dravidian language from which later different Dravidian languages monopolised certain peculiarities. This would also show that they had their origin in South Inida, and when other evidences point to Andhra Pradesh, there should remain no shadow of doubt that their original home lay in Andhradeśa.

The recent find of the earliest Sātavāhana coins at Koṭaliṅgāla and Sangareḍḍy in the Karīmnagar district of Andhra Pradesh is a clear pointer to the region where we have to locate the original centre of Sātavāhana political authority. The name Andhra was in ancient times not used to denote only the Godāvarī-Kṛishṇā region of Andhra Pradesh, as believed in certain quarters, but could have denoted all or any Telugu-speaking regions/region occupied by the Andhra people. The Buddhist Pāli texts point to the possibility of the Andhras living immediately to the south of Majjhima-desa (Madhyadeśa), and we have references to the town of Setakannika, perhaps connected with the Sātavāhanas, which lay on its southern border.[49] Earlier still, the *Aitareya-brāhmṇa* (VII. 92. 18) mentions the Andhras together with the Puṇḍras, Śabaras, Pulindas and Mūtibas on the south of the Āryan country which should suffice to show that the Andhras originally inhabited the region to the south, how much south

we are not told, of the Vindhyas which formed the southern bordr of Āryavārta or Madhyadeśa and the adjoining region of the Deccan. In Rock Edict XIII of Aśoka the Andhras are referred to after the Bhojas and Pitinikas or Bhoja-Pitinikas, and in Rock Edict V the Pitinikas are named after Raṭhikas,[50] showing thereby that the Raṭhikas and Bhojas of Vidarbha and Maharashtra were the neighbours of the Andhras who inhabited the Telangānā region of Andhra Pradesh. This should leave no doubt that the name Andhra was not confined to the region watered by Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā but included within its ambit the area now known as Telangānā as well. In fact, this notion is entirely of modern origin due to the fact that the Telangānā region was included in the Nizam's Hyderābād State while the Kṛishṇā-Godāvarī region formed part of the British Presidency of Madras and known among the locals as Andhradesa in order to distinguish it from the Tamil and Kannada speaking provinces which were huddled together for adminstrative reasons. Thus there is no inherent difficulty in regarding the Telangānā region as the original scene of the Sātavāhana power.

Now the question as to why the Sātavāhanas (or Sādavāhanas which is the earliest spelling)[51] are spoken of only by this name in their own inscriptions as well as in some later writings remains to be and can be easily answered. They referred to themselves as Sādavāhana or Sātavāhana only not because they did not emanate from Andhradeśa but due to the fact that the family to which they belonged had come to be known by this name in order to distriguish themselves from other people or families of the Andhras.

In short, Andhra was their original stock and home and Sādavāhana or Sātavāhana was their family-name (*kula-nāma*) and, as seen above, is referred to as such in their epigraphs.[52]

Reference may be made here to the designation Andhra-bhṛitya which is often taken to refer to the Sātavāhanas in the Purāṇas. This myth was for the first time popularised by R.G. Bhandarkar who felt that it was used in the Purāṇas to describe the Sātavāhanas as 'Andhras who were servants or dependents',[53] thus taking it as a *karmadhāraya* compound. V. S. Sukthankar, however, took it as a *tatpurusha* compound and proposed to render it by 'servants of the Andhras'. Thus, according to him, the Sātavāhanas themselves were not Andhras but only vassals of the latter.[54] The theory of R.G. Bhandarkar was revived by K. Gopalachari who took the expression in question to mean 'Andhra servants' because, in his opinion, the Sātavāhanas were Andhras in origin and were servants or officers of the Mauryas posted in the Western Deccan.[55] Gurty Venkat Rao followed Bhandarkar and Gopalachari and treated the expressions *Andhra-bhṛitya* and *Andhra-jātīya* as interchangeable and took them together to denote the Sātavāhanas who were 'Andhras by community and at the same time acquired power as servants of some other power.'[56] However, all these expalanations are totally unwarranted and uncalled for as the appellation in question is actually applied by the Purāṇa-writers not with reference to the Sātavāhanas[57] but their successors who were once their vassals.[58] This expression must be taken as a *tatpurusha*, as done by Sukthankar, but as employed not for the Sātavāhanas but to their successors.

II
CHRONOLOGY

Chronology is another highly intriguing problem of Sātavāhana history, and even the general period of the emergence of Sātavāhana power forms one of the most knotty and as yet unsettled questions of ancient Indian history. Some historians are bent on placing this event as early as some time in the latter half of the third century BC shortly after Aśoka's reign,[59] while otheres would relegate it to about the middle or the latter half of the first century BC.[60] There are still others who would prefer to divide the Sātavāhana history into two phases dating the rise of the Sātavāhanas in the third century BC and the supposed restoration of the allegedly lost independent status of the dynasty under Simuka in the latter half of the first century BC.[61]

The principal reason for the prevalence of so widely divergent views on the problem is the fact that the Purāṇas contain conflicting statements regarding the total number of what they call Andhra or Andhra-jātīya kings and the period of their total rule. The *Vāyu, Brahmānda, Bhagavata* and *Vishṇu Purāṇas* make the general statement that there were thirty kings,[62] though the number of kings actually mentioned by them varies from seventeen to twenty-five.[63] The *Matsya-Purāṇa*, however, gives the total number of kings as nineteen,[64] but some of the manuscripts actually name thirty, while the names met with in other manuscripts range between twenty-one and twenty-eight.[65] The case is similar in respect of the total duration of their rule. Most of the Purāṇas treating of the subject agree that the Andhra kings ruled for a period of over four centuries, though the actual figures given by them differ from one another by a few years.[66] Another tradition recorded in the *Vāyu-purāṇa* would, however, make us believe that the Andhras ruled for a period of three hundred years.[67] As against this, the total of years assigned to individual rulers amounts to $448^{1}/_{2}$ years according to the *Mastsya* and $272^{1}/_{2}$ according to the *Vāyu*.[68] It would follow from the foregoing that there were two different traditions on these points; according to one of them there were some thirty kings altogether and the durations of their rule covered over four centuries, whereas according to another tradition there were about nineteen kings with about three centuries or a little less as the total length of their rule. Considering the fact that the Sātavāhana rule is known to have terminated early in the third century (or say around AD 225) AD, the supporters of the first tradition are left with no alternative but to date the emergence of the dynastic power in the latter half of the third[69] or around the beginning of the following century BC. As against this, those championing the second tradition are naturally inclined to place this event in the first century BC. Thus there is a gap of nearly a couple of centuries between the results of the two traditions.

However, whereas there is noticed such a wide gap between the two Purāṇic traditions about the total number of Andhra-Sātavāhana rulers and the duration of their rule, all the Purāṇas without a single exception are at one regarding another, and therefore probably

much more dependable, tradition according to which the first of the Andhra kings, whose name is spelt variously but the correct contemporary or near contemporary form is Chhimuka or Simuka,[70] became king and obtained the earth by overthrowing the last Kāṇvāyana king Suśarman.[71] The second view concerning the epoch of the Sātavāhana rule naturally gets precedence over the other opinion as it conforms to this unanimous tradition.

In view of the disagreement among the Purāṇas, historians have tried to tackle the problem from some other angles. Reference must in this connection be made to the larger Nāṇeghāṭ sacrificial inscription put up by Vedi, during the lifetime of his mother Nāganikā, the widowed queen of Sātakarṇi,[72] the third Andhra-Sātavāhana king according to the Purāṇas,[73] and the shorter label inscriptions in a cave at the same locality.[74] George Bühler[75] and, following him, a few other scholars[76] were inclined to date these records on palaeographical grounds in the first half of the second century BC. The statement of the well-known Hathigumphā inscription of the Mahāmeghavāhana king Khāravela that he despatched his forces to the west without caring for Sātakarṇi[77] is also cited in support of this early date for the Nāṇeghāṭ records[78] on the grounds of supposed reference therein to the 165th year of the Muriya (Maurya)-kāla[79] and the 103rd year after Nandarāja.[80] Others strongly contest it, date these records not much earlier than the close of the first century BC, dispute any allusion to the Mauryan reckoning and interpret the expression *Naṁdarāja-ti-vasa-sata* as referring to three hundred years (round figure) since the Nanda rulers.[81] It is worth remembering in this connection that even Bühler, who placed the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions in the first half of the second century BC, had observed that 'the characters of the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions belong to a period anterior by about 100 years to those of the edicts of Gautamīputra Sātakaraṇi and his son Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāryi.'[81a] He further stressed the point by observing that 'the differences between the characters of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi's and those of the Naneghat documents are such that it is not possible at a distance of more than about 100 years.'[82] He could date the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions as well as the record of Kaṇha (Kṛishṇa), the second member of the Andhra-Sātavāhana dynasty according to the Purāṇas, at Nāsik[83] in the first half of the second century BC as he believed that Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi lived a little earlier than the middle of the following century before Christ.[84] But now that nobody place Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi earlier than about mid-first century AD, following Bühler's argument, one cannot date Nāṇeghāṭ documents earlier than the middle of the first century BC. What is still more astonishing is that even some of those scholars who date Gautamīpura Sātakarṇi's reign in the first half of the second century AD continue dating Nāṇeghāṭ records even earlier than Bühler had suggested, around the close of the third century BC, ignoring Bühler's well-considered warning.[85] According to our chronology, these records have to be placed about mid-first century AD,[85a] a date that would agree with the unanimous Purāṇic tradition making the first Andhra-Sātavāhana king Chhimuka (or Simuka) overthrow his nominal suzerain, the last Kāṇvāyana king Suśarman, before he could get an all-India recognition. It must also be remembered in this context that Bühler did not believe in an

over-four-century-long duration of the Andhra-Sātavāhana rule. 'Nor is there, says he, any guarantee that the dynasty of Simuka-Śipraka ruled during about 450 years, much less that Simuka-Śipraka reigned 350 or 360 years before Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi.'[86] But those who date the rise of the Sātavāhana power in the latter half of the third century BC connive at Bühler's verdict regarding the palaeographical differences between the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions on the one hand and the records of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and Vasishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi on the other and the time-gap warranted by them, apparently as these are inconvenient to them, and continue to place the two sets of records at a distance of over three centuries.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that the palaeographical evidence is of some help in settling a rough chronological framework in a general way in the absence of any other evidence, but is not quite dependable for fixing exact dates, or even a period within narrow limits, of inscriptions and the rulers or events known from them. It is quite evident from the instant case where the same records are dated by different epigraphists at widely separated dates on the same palaeographical considerations. Cases are known of dates fixed exclusively on palaeographical grounds proving wide off the mark not by merely decades but centuries.[87]

Important evidence for determining the initial period of the Sātavāhana rule has been furnished by the stratigraphy of the extensive digs at Nevāsā on the river Pravarā, a tributary of the Godāvarī, in the Ahmadnagar district of Maharashtra. These excavations have brought to light six periods of human habitation the last three of which belong to the historical phase. The latest one is the Muslim-Maratha period which does not concern us in the present context. Period IV, termed Early Historical, and Period V, called Indo-Roman or Late Early Historical have, however, an important bearing on the instant problem. Period IV has yielded coins of, *inter alia*, two early Sātavāhana rulers, viz. Siri Sātakarṇi and Sātavāhana, while the finds of Period V include the issues of the later Sātavāhanas. The determination of the chronological limits of these periods, especially those of Period IV, therefore, will go a long way in settling the perplexing riddle of the epoch of the Sātavāhana rule. Period IV is said to have been characterised by the use of iron, black-and-red ware, the coarse red and a sprinkling of Northern Black Polished (NBP) ware. This, along with the early Sātavāhana coins encountered in the various layers of this period, has led the excavators to date its commencement to the first half of the second century BC.[88] As regards the *terminus ad quem* of this period, the excavators at first dated it to *c.* 50 BC, but later brought it down to the beginning of the Christian era.[89] The cultural equipment of Period V included Red Polished wares such as the Megarian-like, the Rouletted ware, the amphorae and the criss-cross painted Andhra ware and coins of the later Sātavāhanas including Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and Gautamīputra Yajña Sātakarṇi. The excavators have pointed out that at Arikāmeḍu and Śiśupalgarh the Rouletted ware has been dated from *c.* first century BC to the first-second century AD, and at Brahmagiri and Chandravallī from the first to the third century AD. The amphorae have been placed in *c.* first century BC at Taxila and *c.* first

century AD at Arikāmeḍu. The decorated Megarian-like has been dated to the same period. The Andhra painted ware from Nevāsā is identical in design and fabric with those from Brahmagiri and may not be earlier than the first century AD. On these considerations Period V has been dated to *c.* first century BC-second-third century AD.[90]

A close scrutiny of the relevant data, however, would lead one to doubt the above dating. None of the evidences relied upon by the excavators can form a firm base for dating these periods within so well-defined limits. As admitted by H.D. Sankalia, the NBP in the Deccan cannot be dated as early as in the north (5th-4th centuries BC) and its date in the former region can be determined only on the basis of the circumstantial evidence of associated finds like coins. It must be remembered in this connection that the NBP sherds have been reported from the topmost layers of Period IV which, according to the excavators themselves, can in no way be placed much earlier than the beginning of the Christian era.[91] The silver-plated copper punch-marked coin, which is obviously a counterfeit,[92] also comes from the uppermost layers of this period and consequently cannot be dated much anterior to the commencement of the Christian era.[93] S.B. Deo, who has made detailed study of the coins from these excavations, appears to employ the coins of the early Sātavāhana rulers met with in the various strata of Period IV as a double-edged weapon for fixing their date as well as the epoch of the Sātavāhana rule. Thus we are told on the one hand that 'the set of five coins bearing the legend Siri Sātavāhana and coming from layers earlier than those giving the coins of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi are new and help in assigning the layers of Period IV to about the second century BC.'[94] It is argued on the other hand that 'their (of the coins of Sātavāhana) association with the antiquities of pre-Red Polished ware horizons supports their dating to about the second century BC. In view of this,' it is added, 'it may not be incorrect to push back the origin of the Sātavāhanas to 3rd-2nd century BC, rather than to assign them to the 1st century BC, as some scholars try to advocate.'[95] The reasoning underlying these arguments is quite unintelligible. First, as the epoch of the Sātavāhana power itself is a bone of contention, the occurrence of Sātavāhana coins of uncertain dates can be ill-harnessed for dating the layers in question. Secondly, the dates of the Sātavāhana kings whose coins are found in stratified excavations must be fixed on the basis of layers proper wherein they are recovered and not on that of the general cultural period to which the coin-yielding layers belong. Now, all the coins of king Sātavāhana are found in the topmost layers of Period IV which the excavators themselves do not assign a date much earlier than the first century AD.[96] Then, it is not correct to hold that these coins came from pre-Red Polished ware strata. A glance at the chart explaining the concordance and correlation of the layers at Nevāsā would be enough to convince that coins of king Sātavāhana have been reported from layer 3 of Trenches I, X and Y and layer 8 of Trench E which are co-eval with layer 5 of Trench C which has yielded Red Polished wares like the amphorae and the Megarian-like. Then again, amphorae are met with in layer 4 of Trench Y which underlies the layer giving coins of king Sātavāhana.[97] And as seen earlier, Red Polished ware continued

to be used for some three centuries after Christ. It would thus follow that nothing found in layers of Period IV supports third-second century BC epoch for the rise of the Sātavāhana power. Further, there is reason to hold that the *terminus ad quem* of Period IV and the *terminus a quo* of the following period lie not about 50 BC or the beginning of the first century AD, as contended by the excavators, but considerably later. The Red Polished ware was current for three or four centuries AD and as such its occurence connot be relied upon for dating Period V within closer limits. The only firm basis for determining the archaeological limits of this period is afforded by the late Sātavāhana coins on the one hand and the coins doubtfully attributed to the Pallavas on the other.[98] As for the upper limit, coins of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and Gautamīputra Yajña Sātakarṇi would lead us to date it not much earlier than the close of the first century AD.[99] The coins doubtfully designated as Pallava actually belong to the type commonly styled Vishṇukuṇḍin a very large quantity whereof has been reported from all over Maharashtra.[100] Three such coins from Paunār in the Wardhā district were published and for the first time attributed to the Vishṇukuṇḍins by the present author,[101] and this ascription has been followed in all subsequent publications including the report on the Paunār excavations while reporting the discovery of a large hoard of such coins.[102] Now, the emergence of the Vishṇukuṇḍin power cannot be dated much earlier than the fifth century AD, and the find of the Vishṇukuṇḍin type coins in the topmost layers of Period V would naturally lead one to date the close of this period around the fifth century AD. We should therefore like to propose dating Period V from mid-first century to the fifth century AD. Conversely the chronological limits of Period IV will also have to be brought down by about a century and may be dated between the late first century BC/beginning of the first century AD to end-first century AD/early second century AD. And consequently the find of early Sātavāhana coins in the layers of Period IV would only support around mid-first century BC epoch for the rise of the Sātavāhanas.[103] Reference may in the present context be also made to the stratigraphic position of the hitherto unique coin of prince Śaktikumāra found in the excavation at Sātānikoṭa (Nandikotkur taluk, Kurnool district, Andhra Pradesh).[104] As we have shown elsewhere,[105] this Śaktikumaṛa is generally identified with Satisṛi (Śaktiśrī) of the larger Nāṇeghāṭ inscription and was, in all likelihood, the fourth member of the dynasty. This coin was reportedly found in an earlier layer of Period II which has been dated basing on associated evidence to *c.* first century BC–*c.* third century AD. The associated pottery includes russet coated painted ware which goes well with the general dating of this period.[106] The brick-sizes are in agreement with those of the corresponding phase in the excavations at Peddabankūr, Nevāsā and Śālihuṇḍam, and so are the double-perforated tiles with those recovered from Bhokardan, Brahmapurī and a host of other sites. Minor antiquities associated with the coin include, *inter alia*, a circular tubular agate bead comparable to those from Taxila dated to the first century BC and from Ahichchhatrā, Koṇḍāpur and Maskī found in levels not earlier than the first century AD, and a turtle pendent comparable in shape to those from Kauṇḍinyapura and Bhokardan none

of which can be dated prior to the first century BC. Another related find is the solitary terracotta female figurine produced from double moulds, a technique adopted from the Romans around the beginning of the first century AD. Thus stratigraphically speaking, the coin, which was found about 15 to 20 cm. above the earliest habitational deposit of Period II on a well-defined floor-level, can only the dated about the commencement of the first century AD, leave aside the internal evidence of the coin itself.[107]

Reference must be made in this connnection to Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* which affords important evidence against dating the emergence of the Sātavāhana power immediately following the end of the Maurya empire. Admittedly the drama relates to historical events following the destruction of the last Maurya king Bṛihadratha by Pushyamitra, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty. A central happening unfolded in it concerns the emergence of Vidarbha as an independent state under Yajñasena, a near relation of the slain Maurya king Bṛihadratha's minister and naturally hostile to Pushyamitra Śuṅga (*c.* 187-151 BC) and his son Agnimitra. Yajñasena's *antapāla* (officer-in-charge of protecting the borders) arrested the former's cousin Mādhavasena while on his way to Vidiśā, the metropolis of his friend Agnimitra. On being asked to release him, Yajñasena stipulated the precondition of the liberation of the imprisoned Maurya minister by Agnimitra. Being angered, Agnimitra despatched an expedition against Vidarbha under his brother-in-law Vīrasena, Yajñasena was worsted and Mādhavasena freed. Vidarbha was split between Yajñasena and Mādhavasena with the river Varadā forming their boundary and both acknowledging Pushyamitra's authority. To sum up, Vidarbha became an independent state following the fall of the Maurya empire and was subsequently divided into two dependencies under Pushyamitra. And there is some evidence to indicate Vidarbha's inclusion in the Sātavāhana kingdom during the reign of Sātakarṇi who was either a contemporary of or somewhat earlier than Pushyamitra according to the upholders of the dating of the emergence of the Sātavāhana power in the latter half of the third century BC.[108] Paunī, an antiquarian site in the Bhaṇḍārā district of Vidarbha, has yielded two potin coins of Sātakarṇi: one a stratified find during excavation[109] and the other a surface discovery.[110] As these pieces are of a low value, there is hardly any chance of their hailing from a far off locality, their find suggesting the incorporation of the Vidarbha region in the kingdom of Sātakarṇi, the third member of the Andhra-Sātavāhana dynasty according to the Purāṇic accounts.[111] As would be shown in the sequel, a coin of Sūryamitra of the 'Mitra' dynasty of Vidarbha, counterstruok by Sātakarṇi, has also been reported. In case the third century BC epoch is accepted, the non-reference to Sātakarṇi and instead mention of Yajñasena and Mādhavasena by Kālidāsa in the context of Vidarbha immediately after the Mauryas will have to be explained. By negating the third century epoch for the emergence of the Sātavāhanas, Kālidāsa's evidence lends support to the first century BC theory for this event.

Till a few decades before there was not much archaeological, particularly numismatic, material to fill up the interval between the close of the Maurya rule and the rise of the

Sātavāhanas in the Deccan, and consequently there could at least be some negative support for the view dating this event immediately after Aśoka or following the end of the Mauryas. But thanks to concerted archaeological work, excavations and explorations during the the past few years we now have a lot of coins found in a stratigraphic context as well as otherwise datable to the pre-Sātavāhana epoch sufficient enough to cover the gap between the Mauryas and mid-first century BC. Regional variations barred, we can now aver that the numismatic history of the whole of the Indian subcontinent is identical from a technical viewpoint : punch-marked coins followed by uninscribed cast copper, which were the former's junior contemporaries, and uninscribed and inscribed die-struck specie. The entire region which was later occupied by the Sātavāhanas has thrown up a large volume of such coins enough to cover almost a couple of centuries following Aśoka. In view of difficulties of definite ascription we may leave aside a detailed treatment of uninscribed cast and die-struck specie encountered in a large volume all over the Telangānā region of Andhra Pradesh, northern Karnataka, Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh,[112] and confine ourselves to only the inscribed coins that followed them. These specie, it would follow, have furnished evidence which has brought to our notice a lot many ruling families and individual chiefs who held the region prior to the Sātavāhanas. The Telangānā region of Andhra Pradesh, which was the cradle of the Sātavāhana power, has given the coins of Kaṁvāya (?), Samagopa and Gobhadra;[113] the Vidarbha region has yielded coins of rulers with *mitra*- and *bhadra*- ending names and therefore designated Mitras and Bhadras respectively. We know of at least three Mitra rulers (Bhūmimitra, Kaṇhamitra and Sūryamitra) and four Bhadra kings (Damabhadra, Dharmabhadra, Sarvabhadra [or Śarvabhadra] and Satyabhadra) who ruled almost contemporaneously during the pre-Sātavāhana age.[114] We have a unique piece of Sūryamitra restruck by Sātakarṇi which establishes explicitly the priority of the Mitras to the Sātavāhanas.[115] Base metal coins of a Dāmabhadra and a Nārāyaṇamitra have been found in Mālwā[116] and those of kings with *datta*-ending names from Ḍāhala (Jabalpur region)[117] of Madhya Pradesh. Bhadra coins have been reported to have been found from pre-Sātavāhana layers in the recent excavations at Aḍam, a site of great archaeological importance, in the Nagpur district. The coin-yielding strata belong to Period V dated to *c.* 150 BC-AD 250.[118] This find is indeed a very important stratigraphic evidence that clinches the issue once for all by firmly establishing the priority of the Bhadras over the Sātavāhanas in this region and reinforces archaeologically what was earlier known from the numismatic evidence in the form of Sūryamitra's coin restruck by Sātakarṇi mentioned above. The period of their rule must have covered nearly a hundred years following the termination of uninscribed cast specie. It should leave absolutely no doubt about the mid-first century BC epoch for the rise of the Sātavāhanas.

The same general conclusion is vouched for by a review of the evolution of early Indian coin-legends. The earliest Indian specie including punch-marked series and a vast majority of cast pieces[119] carry no legends whatever. Legends made their appearance on Indian coins at a fairly late stage, there being difference of opinion regarding its genesis. Some hold it

to be an indigenous development, while according to others, it was primarily due to the influence of the coins issued by the Greek rulers of Indian subcontinent.[120] We feel very strongly that the legends of early Indian specie perhaps started making their appearance naturally as an outcome of the gradual development of the minting technique indigenously, but the practice of giving names of issuing authorities preceded by regal style, both terminating in genitive case, like those met with on the Sātavāhana specie received a strong stimulus from the Indo-Greek issues. This new transforming feature took place not earlier than the first century BC.[121]

Curiously enough, even those dating the emergence of the Sātavāhana rule in the first century BC differ over a very vital point. Basing on the unanimous Purāṇic tradition, most scholars of this school date the emergence of the Sātavāhana power following the Kāṇvas whose rule covered forty-five years and who were preceded by the Śuṅgas and the Mauryas who ruled in an ascending order for 112 and 137 years respectively. And deducting 294 years of their combined rule from 324 or 322 BC, the date of Chandragupta Mauyra's accession, we reach 30 or 28 BC for Simuka, the founder of the Sātavāhana dynasty. Bhandarkar duo (R.G.[122] and D.R.[123]), however, is inclined to hold that 112 years of the Śuṅga rule include 45 years of the Kāṇvāyana rule and accordingly date Simuka's accession to 73 BC. To bring home this point it would be best to quote *in extenso* R.G. Bhandarkar: 'It, therefore, appears likely that when the princes of the Śuṅga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped the whole power, and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters, but reducing to the character of nominal sovereigns; and this supposition is strengthened by the fact that like the Peshwas they were Brāhmaṇas and not Kshatriyas. Thus then these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śuṅgas, includes 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas. The Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas, therefore, were uprooted, and the family of the Āndhrabhṛityas[124] came to power in 73 BC.'[125] Also D.R. Bhandarkar echoed this view: 'It appears that the Kāṇvas, like the Peshwas of modern day, usurped the power of their masters, the Śuṅgas, and that Śiśuka (Simuka) by supplanting the power of the Kāṇvas supplanted that of the Śuṅgas also.' The date of this event is, however, placed by him in 75 BC.

The analogy between the Śuṅgas and the Marāṭhās on one hand and the Kāṇvas and the Peshwās on the other, however, is only apparent and without basis. For the Peshwās were sovereign rulers and acknowledged only the *de jure* suzerainty of the Marāṭhās which was not the same with the Śuṅgas and Kāṇvas respectively. The Purāṇas are quite unequivocal on the point that the Kāṇvas succeeded the Śuṅgas some of whom continued to exercise power, perhaps as vassals of the Kāṇvas, for the full duration of 45 years of the Kāṇva authority only to be finally overthrown together with the last Kāṇva king Suśarman by Simuka mentioned under various misspellings. The Purāṇas unanimously aver that the ten Śuṅga monarchs ruled for 112 years whereafter they were supplanted by the Kāṇvas, the first of whom, Vasudeva,

a minister (*amātya*) of the last Śuṅga king Devabhūti who was addicted to vices right from his childhood, uprooted his master and himself became king. Vasudeva's dynasty, called Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana, had four members who, together, exercised regal power for forty-five years whereafter its last member Suśarman was violently overthrown by his Andhra vassal (*bhritya*) Simuka (called variously) who also put an end to whatever was still left of the Suṅga power.[126] The description of the first Kāṇvāyana king Vasudeva, who was responsible for the overthrow of the Śuṅga dynasty, himself as a Śuṅga in some of the Purāṇas is obviously due to textual corruption with which historians are quite familiar.

Mention may be made here of the explanation of the varying Purāṇic statements regarding the total duration of the rule of the Andhras vis-a-vis the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvāyanas suggested by Vincent A. Smith who himself believed in the longer duration.[127] He held that the Andhra-Sātavāhanas actually ruled for 457 years and if the period of Śuṅga-Kāṇvāyana rule amounting to 157 years is deducted from it one would get 300 years which is the shorter duration of Andhra rule according to the Purāṇas. And the Sātavāhana power in the North lasted for this shorter duration with the result that not many details about it were known to the custodians of the Purāṇic tradition some of whom in consequence afford a shorter duration and number of kings and others accepted the full list and longer period. This standpoint is cited with approval by Gurty Venkat Rao[128] and A.S. Altekar.[129] It is, however, quite improper to charge the so-called northern custodians of the Purāṇic tradition with ignorance of facts, for it is they who refer to both the traditions—longer and shorter list of kings and duration—and more often than not the same Purāṇa furnishes both the traditions.[130] As against this, however, all the Purāṇic texts are unanimous about the tradition that the Andhras rose to power after their first king, who was a vassal of the Kāṇvāyanas, overthrew by force the last Kāṇvāyana king Suśarman.

It would, however, be equally inappropriate to accuse the Purāṇa compilers of deliberately inflating the number and duration of Andhra kings and thereby committing a fraud while averring that they (30 Andhra kings) ruled for a little over four and a half centuries. For, it is quite likely that all the Andhra-Sātavāhana kings numbered thirty or thereabouts[131] with the total period of their rule amounting to some 450 odd years. However, these figures do not refer of necessity to the imperial line that had less than twenty rulers with the total rule lasting a little less than three centuries.[132] Even a champion of longer list and duration of rule like K. Gopalachari feels that Skandastambhi included as no. 5 in the *Matsya* list was actually an imaginary figure.[133] There is some evidence that indicates clearly that at least a few rulers belonged to regional branches of the dynasty, either in the name-forms or otherwise. Thus, coins of king Āpīlaka,[134] no. 8 of the longer Purāṇic list, have been spotted only from Dakshiṇa Kosala (Chhattīsgaḍh region, Madhya Pradesh) and were evidently struck at the Mallār mint in the Bilāspur district.[135] That during the last seven decades since the first find of his then unique coin only two more have been found so far and that too

only in South Kosala and of the same type produced at the same mint[136] compels us to conclude that he was a member of the Kosalā[137] branch of the dynasty and did not belong to the imperial line. Similarly, Kuntala Svātikarṇa (no. 13 of the *Matsya* list), whose historicity is established by Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (II. 2.28),[138] must also have been a local king as suggested by his name being prefixed by Kuntala. Likewise, Chakora Svātikarṇa, the twenty-first Andhra king according to the *Matsya* list, also may be taken as a member of a local branch belonging to the Chakora mountainous region included in the empire of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi.[139] Another well-known Sātavāhana king, Hāla, also probably belonged to the Kuntala branch.[140]

Then we have some Sātavāhana monarchs from inscriptions and coins but not included in the Purāṇic lists of Andhra kings. These include Vediśrī[141] and Śaktiśrī,[142] two sons of Sātakarṇi and Naganika, Kauśikīputra Sātakarṇi, Kochhiputa (Kautsīputra) Sātakarṇi[143] and Māḍharīputra Sātakarṇi,[144] of the imperial branch not to speak of Kumbha, Karṇa and Saka Sātakarṇi of the Vidarbha branch.[145] We are not sure about the exact position—imperial or branch-line—of the second to fifth kings as coins were not necessarily issued by emperors only. Of these, the first is known exclusively from the Nāṇeghāṭ sacrificial inscription, the second from this inscription as well as monetary issues and the rest only from coins. We are therefore in general agreement with R.G. Bhandarkar when he observes: ''The period of three hundred years and the seventeen names given in the Vāyu Purāṇa refer probably to the main branch. The Matsya seems to me to put together the princes of all the branches, and thus makes them out to be thirty... . Thus then the Vāyu and the Matsya Purāṇas each give a correct account, but of different things.''[146] However, we must hasten to add that even the shorter list of the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, which professedly confines itself to the main or imperial branch,[147] drops some well-documented names after Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi,[148] and also includes such names as Āpilaka[149] and Chakora.[150] Thus no extant list is full, correct and wholly reliable, the *Vāyu* is preferable though. One very important point merits a serious consideration in the present context. Several names are still restricted only to the Purāṇic lists with no inscriptional or numismatic support surfacing despite the lapse of over a century and a half since the Andhra-Sātavāhanas came to scholarly notice. And this is especially true of the period prior to Gautmīputra Sātakarṇi while for the monarchs following him we have got a lot of inscriptional or coin data. Consequently we shall not be unjustified in looking at the earlier names not yet vouched for otherwise with distrust and treat them as unhistorical at the moment in so far as the main line is concerned.

And there is incontrovertible numismatic and epigraphical evidence to show that there was a protracted conflict for supremacy over Deccan and the concomitant trade routes between the Sātavāhanas and the Kshaharāta monarch Nahapāna with unstable intermediate fortunes and final success choosing the Sātavāhana monarch Gautamīputra Sātkarṇi.[151] This event took place in or prior to AD 78 when the Kārdamaka king Chashṭana ascended the

throne and the Śaka era commenced.[152] Hardly a little less than a century and a quarter elapsed between the foundation of the Andhra-Sātavāhana power and the time of the great Gautamīputra within which it is just impossible to accommodate all the twenty-two kings who ruled before him according to the longer list. Then we have irrefutable numismatic data to prove that not much time intervened between the third Andhra-Sātavāhana monarch Sātakarṇi on the one hand and the Kshaharāta potentate Nahapāna, who was vanquished by Gautamīputra Satakarṇi, on the other, which lends firm support to the shorter duration and number of kings. Junnar (Puṇe district, Maharashtra), which served as the capital of early Sātavāhanas and of Nahapāna in Maharashtra,[153] has given us in recent years cheap metal specie of Sātakarṇi and Nahāpana with a completely identical obverse, viz. lion standing facing left with uplifted tail, mouth open, three-peaked hill under the lion's body, in front of what was most probably ploughshare and a semicircular Brāhmī legend along the upper edge, whereas the reverse type is different : on Sātakarṇi's coins it is Ujjain symbol while on Nahapāna's strung bow-arrow pointing upwards—thunderbolt as on his silver specie.[154] This similarity of obverse type is not restricted to Sātakarṇi alone among the Sātavāhanas but is noticed also on some coins of king Sātavāhana[155] who must be identified with Simuka (or Chhimuka) Sātavāhana of the Nāṇeghāṭ label inscription and coins hailing from the Telangānā and Vidarbha region[156] and may not unlikely be found elsewhere as well. And this fact clearly clinches the issue pointing out that there was not substantial time-gap between Simuka, the founder of the dynasty, and Nahapāna-Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and thereby putting the shorter chronology on firm footing.[157]

We may thus conclude that the smaller number of Andhra-Sātavāhana kings and period of their authority are very close to the facts in so far as the imperial line is concerned. The enlarged list of kings and longer duration includes members of various branches and their regnal periods taken together. Simuka (or Chhimuka) Sātavāhana, founder of the sovereign line of rulers, lived around mid-first century BC. This is the only logical deduction from a critical comparative assessment of the available data, literary and archaeological.[158]

III

CHRONICLE

Having dwelt upon the problems of original home, nomenclature and general chronology of the Andhra-Sātavāhanas, we may now turn our attention to the meagre information the Purāṇas furnish about the individual members of the dynasty. It would be noticed that the details do not go beyond bare cataloguing of names with their regnal years except in the case of the first member about whom some historical information is also offered. And these facts also are more often than not vitiated by variant readings resulting from highly defective manuscript traditions.[159] It would be our attempt to chronicle all the details together with variations in readings and to see how far they are supported by or opposed to the data

derived from inscriptions and coins as well as other archaeological sources in general. We shall also record what information we get from other later literary sources only in so far as the Purāṇic data are concerned. It would be noticed that these pieces of information often correct or supplement the Purānic chronicles and sometimes have only corroborative value which, too, is highly valuable when there is always a lurking suspicion about the correctness of each and every reading and point.

Chhimuka or Simuka

The founder of the dynasty is mentioned in the Purāṇas by various forms of the name, and only the terminal letter (*ka*) is the one about which there is no difference. The *Matsya* manuscripts spell it variously as Śiśuka, Śiśruka, Śiśukra, Śikhuka, Kiṁśuka, Śiṁśuka, etc., while the manuscripts of the other Purāṇas generally give Sindhuka as his name and *Vishnu* has the readings Chhiptaka, Śivika, Pulaka, Puchchhaka and Śipraka. A single manuscript of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* (*eVā* of Pargiter) alone affords a name much closer than others to the name Chhimuka found on his coins, viz. Chhismaka.[160] And it is quite possible that the middle component, viz. *mu*, was misread as *sma* by the copyist while retaining the first and last letters as they must have been originally in the manuscript used by him as his base. This should suffice to demonstrate the comparative trustworthiness of the *eVā* manuscript of the *Vāyu* and the point that a reading found in a single manuscript need not necessarily be rejected in favour of a reading/readings met with in numerous other manuscripts.[161]

In any case the extant evidence establishes that he called himself and was popular among his contemporaries as Chhimuka Sātavāhana[162] and is spoken of in a slightly later record[163] put up by his brother as Simuka Sātavāhana.[164] Interchangeability of sibilants and *chavarga* letters *ch* and *chh* in the dialect of Prakrit being in vogue during that age in Andhradeśa as illustrated by numerous instances,[165] this difference in the initial letter of the name[165a] need occasion no surprise. It is quite possible that both these forms stand for Sanskrit Śrīmukha, 'beautiful-faced', though there cannot be any certainty and it may be some hitherto unknown Prakrit or colloquial word then prevalent in Telagānā region.[166]

There is absolutely no information regarding the parentage and upbringing of this brilliant man responsible for carving out a large kingdom and launching his family on the imperial track. The Purāṇas describe him as a servant (*bhṛitya*) of the last Kāṇva king Suśarman. It is therefore quite likely that he began his career as a vassal, perhaps nominal, and taking advantage of his weakness carried out his victorious arms far and wide. The scene of his early career was the Telangānā and adjoining area which has yielded a lot of his specie.[167] And thence he expanded to the Vidarbha region[168] which fell on way to Vidiśā where he finally vanquished his erstwhile overlord Suśarman as stated in the Purāṇas.

A final ascription of base metal specie with the legend *rañño siri-sāt(d)avāhanasa*, 'of king

Sāt(d)avāhana', is pregnant with serious implications for historical reconstruction. According to some, this Sātavāhana was the founder of the dynasty preceding Simuka by a few generations,[169] whereas others are inclined to equate him with *Kumāra* Sātavāhana known from a label inscription at Nāṇeghāṭ[170] and regarded as a son of king Sātakarṇi and queen Nāganikā generally,[171] but without enough supporting data. However, neither of these contentions can bear scrutiny. There is not only nothing whatever to warrant the existence of any ruler called Sātavāhana but it is against the extant archaeological (and Purāṇic) evidence. Not only the Purāṇas are reticent about any Andhra king preceding Simuka, they explicitly aver that the 'earth' (kindgom) went (actually 'would') go to or 'became' (actually 'would become') the property of the Andhras after the end of the last Kāṇva king Suśarman.[172] And, as if this were not enough, the Sātavāhana statue-gallery at Nāṇeghāṭ commences with the statue of Simuka Sātavāhana only because he was the first king of the dynasty. The existence of the later personage, who definitely belonged to the dynasty as vouched for by his name (Sātavāhana), is indubitably documented by inscriptional evidence as shown above; but there is not only absolutely nothing to prove that he rose to the position of a king but there are strong reasons to believe that he never ascended the throne and as such there could be no question of his issuing any coin in his own right. The aforesaid Nāṇeghāṭ label inscription[173] definitely shows that his statue was put up there along with a few other members of the family or otherwise connected with it.[174] The cave in question at Nāṇeghāṭ was thus a statue-house or *pratimā-gṛiha* of the early Sātavāhanas like the statue-gallery or *deva-kula* of the Kushāṇas at Māṭ, a suburb of Mathurā. When could these statues be installed? It is commonly held that all these figures were set up by Sātakarṇi or queen Nāganikā at the same time or at different times during the same reign.[175] Can it be true? The *Pratimā-nāṭaka* of Bhāsa, who preceded the celebrated poet-dramatist Kālidāsa, comes to our rescue in solving this riddle. Its central theme from which it has derived its name (*Pratimānāṭaka*) is very pertinent to the issue under discussion. Bharata returned to Ayodhyā from his maternal uncle's home on urgent summons and was relaxing outside the town when he comes to know of the tragic demise of his father Daśaratha on seeing his statue (*pratimā*) placed along with the latter's three ancestors (Dilīpa, Raghu and Aja) in the family's *pratimā-gṛiha* or *deva-kula*. That the statues of only the deceased kings were erected is stated quite explicitly.[176] The practice of putting up the pictures of ancestors after their demise in vogue at present is a remnant of the ancient *pratimā-gṛihas* on a limited scale. The same was the object of the statue-house at Nāṇeghāṭ and only the sculptures of dead personages were installed in it. It must have been instituted immediately after Simuka's demise or slightly later. The installation, perhaps by queen Nāganikā, of the figure (and figure-label which alone is now extant) of *Kumāra* Sātavāhana therefore demonstrates unambiguously that this Sātavāhana passed away when he was only a prince (*Kumāra*), there being therefore no possibility of his ascending the throne and minting these coins. Under these circumstances we are inclined to hold that Chhimuka Sātavāhana himself was responsible for issuing alternately the coins

mentioning him only as king Sātavāhana. And the coins with both the legends (*Chhimuka Sātavāhana* and *Sātavāhana*) have been reported from Koṭaliṅgāla and Saṅgāreḍḍy in Karīmnagar district of the Telangānā region of Andhra Pradesh. And coins with the name Sātavāhana alone have been reported from numerous sites including Koṇḍāpur in the Meḍak district of Telangānā, Nevāsā in the Ahmadnagar district, Junnar in Puṇe district, Marāṭhwāḍā and Vidarbha regions of Maharashtra and of late from Sannati in the Gulbargā district of Karnataka.[177] The discovery of his coins at places so wide apart from each other obviously indicates in a general way that Simuka (or Chhimuka) Sātavāhana by his military and diplomatic moves carved out a large kingdom comprising a major part of the Telangānā and adjacent region of Andhra Pradesh, northern Karnataka and a substantial portion of the present state of Maharashtra including the Vidarbha region. These coins being of cheap metals like copper, lead and potin are not likely, generally speaking, to travel large distances beyond the area of their circulation.

In all likelihood for a major part of his rule he continued to acknowledge nominal authority of the Kāṇvas, and it was towards the end only that he overthrew his Kāṇva suzerain Suśarman. According to most of the Purāṇas, he forcibly uprooted (*prasahya*) Suśarman; but the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* avers that he killed Kānva Suśarman (*hatvā Kāṇvam Suśarmāṇam*).[178] The historicity of these Purāṇic statements is suspected by a few historicans as Simuka was the first member of the dynasty with his rule restricted to a very small area while the Kāṇvas ruled from their capital at Pāṭaliputra (modern Paṭnā) in distant Bihar, making it just impossible for the former to destroy the latter. And most historians favouring longer duration held that Simuka flourished substantially earlier to be a contemporary and vassal of the Kāṇvas. They are of the view that this feat was achieved by a later member of the Sātavāhana dynasty and that the *Purāṇa-kāras* wrongly ascribed it to Simuka.[179] And some of these historians have tried to identify the Andhra-Sātavāhana monarch who could have been a contemporary of Suśarman and achieved this hat trick: he could have been Pulumāvi I (no. 15 of the *Matsya* list),[180] or Svātikarṇa[181] or a second hypothetical king name Simuka omitted by oversight by the Purāṇa-compilers.[182] However, all these assumptions become unnecessary as we now know that the shorter chronology is the correct one and that the focus of the Purāṇic writers shifted from Pāṭaliputra to Vidiśā during the later Śuṅga age. Probably Simuka (or Chhimuka) forcibly extirpated his nominal suzerain Suśarman whose power and authority had already been tottering and who could not withstand his former vassal's onslaught. Such a feat is not quite unattainable for one imbued with determination and matching enterprise, and we know of several even more dazzling instances including Chandragupta Maurya who carved out an almost pan-Indian empire out of nothing within a very short time. This startling achievement put the Sātavāhanas in the centre-stage in the Deccan and Central India, and his grateful younger brother Kṛishṇa, who must have participated in these victorious campaigns, christened the family Sātavāhana (or Sādavāhana) after him.[183]

The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* alone styles him a *vṛishala* or Śūdra,[184] which might have resulted from its author's feeling of disgust against him for his heinous act of destroying his own master. For, the Sātavāhanas spoke of themselves as 'unique Brāhmaṇas' (*eka-bamhaṇa*),[185] thus laying claim to the highest social status. Whether the Sātavāhanas were actually originally of the priestly class or were priests of tribals and were elevated to that class, is a matter beyond the purview of the present discussion.

Simuka-Chhimuka is assigned a reign of twenty-three years unanimously.[186] A major part of this period was probably the one during which he continued to acknowledge the suzerainty of his nominal Kāṇva masters while at the same time carrying out sallies against them, and it was most probably at the close of this period that he finally got rid of vassalage declaring his independence by doing away with the last Kāṇva king Suśarman and destroying whatever was still remaining of the Śuṅgas. The accession of Chhimuka-Simuka may thus be dated around 52 BC and the destruction of Suśarman about 30 BC followed by the termination of his reign shortly thereafter.[187]

Kaṇha (Kṛishṇa)

Chhimuka-Simuka most probably passed away sonless and was consequently succeeded by his younger brother Kṛishṇa.[188] He ruled for eighteen years according to the *Matsya, Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas*, whereas the *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata* assign him only ten years' reign.[189] Following the majority statement, we may date his reign between *c.* 29 and 12 BC.[190]

We have for Kṛishṇa a short two-line inscription in cave 9 at Nāsik[191] and also perhaps a few base metal coins.[192] Basing on the continuance of the Mauryan administrative set-up as illustrated by the Nāsik inscription referring to an officer called *Mahāmātra*, it is held by some that both Simuka (for the whole reign) and Kṛishṇa, to begin with, were vassals of Aśoka and it was only after the latter's demise that Kṛishṇa ruled as an independent monarch for six years.[193] However, as we have seen above, it would be too early a date for Simuka and Kṛishṇa and deserves no credence.

It is quite likely that Kṛishṇa had participated in his brother's campaigns which contributed immensely to the rise of the family as an imperial power. There is no doubt, however, that he cherished great love and reverence for his elder brother and christened the family after him and also set up his statue in the family's statue-gallery (*pratimā-gṛiha*) inaugurated by him, at Nāṇeghāṭ as shown above.[194]

In view of these well-documented facts it is indeed astonishing to find that some of the historians of the Sātavāhanas have surmised enmity between the two brothers which had its repercussions on the succeeding generations. For example, V.S. Bakhle holds that 'Kaṇha was a usurper after Simuka's death,'[195] and a similar view is expressed by V.V. Mirashi.[196] These views amount simply to a wild and baseless guesswork.

Sātakarni

While there exists complete unanimity regarding the first two members of the dynasty, viz. Chhimuka-Simuka and Kṛishṇa, no such agreement is noticed about the post-Kṛishṇa genealogy and chronology. Most of the Purāṇas aver that Kṛishṇa was followed by his son whose name is spelt variously, Sātakarṇi and Mallakarṇi being the commonest and the former accepted commonly by modern scholars and historians.[197] He is given a reign lasting ten or eighteen years.[198] According to the *Matsya*, he was followed by two kings named commonly Pūrṇotsaṅga[199] and Skandhastambhi[200] successively, and both are given a reign eighteen years each. While Sātakarṇi[201] is mentioned in all the Purāṇas, the next two kings are dropped in the *Vāyu*[201a] and Skandhastambhi in the *Brahmāṇḍa, Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata.* What is interesting is that Sātakarṇi is either not mentioned in at least some *Vāyu* manuscripts[202] or his regnal period is left unspecified.[203] Skandhastambhi is said to have been followed by yet another Sātakarṇi[204] who is unanimously assigned a reign lasting fifty-six years.[205] It is pertinent to note that while the second king is called almost unanimously by all the Purāṇas Sātakarṇi[206] and given fifty-six years' reign, the same is not true about the first Sātakarṇi : he is dropped in at least a few manuscripts, his name is spelt variously or the duration of his reign is not given. And the names of his two successors are often left out. Thus their historicity is rather suspect. Moreover, the so-called Sātakarṇi I is credited with several achievements including performance of several sacrifices and facing an aggression from Kaliṅga and controlling sea-borne trade with the Roman empire for which a ten-year reign is found to be too short. The larger Nāṇeghāṭ inscription put up by king Vediśrī appears to describe costly Vedic sacrifices performed by his parents Sātakarṇi and Nāgavaradāyinī or Nāganika[207] jointly.[208] The sacrifices include, *inter alia*, Agnyādheya, Anārambhaṇīya, Aṅgārika, Saptadaśātirātra, Bhagāladaśarātra, Gargātirātra, Gavāmayana, Aṅgirasātirātra, Saptadaśātirātra, Aṅgirasāmayana of six years' duration, Chhandomapavamānātirātra, Trayodaśātirātra, Daśarātra, and, above all, a Rājasūya and at least two Aśvamedhas.[209] Then, the Kaliṅga emperor Khāravela, according to his Hathigumphā cave inscription, sent an expeditionary force comprising infantry, cavalry, elephantry and chariotry without caring for Sātakarṇi to the west in the second year of his reign.[210] Whether the two horse sacrifices performed by him or one of them has something to do with Khāravela's invasion and his success in tiding over it and the possible achievement of victory cannot be ascertained in the present state of inadequate information.[211] A Sātakarṇi is also referred to in an inscription of his foreman of artisans (*āveśanin*) Vāsishṭhīputra (son of a lady of Vasishṭha *gotra*)[212] Ānanda engraved on the inner face of the top architrave of the south gate of the main *stūpa* at Sāñchī.[213] Whether it indicated a reconquest of the Vidiśā region after some revolt of some local ruler is something that cannot be ascertained at present. To us, of course, it is only a pilgrim's record and the significance popularly attached to it by historians is quite unwarranted. A king called Elder Saraganus by the unknown author of the Greek text

Periplus Maris Erythraei, popularly known as *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, paid great attention to maritime trade with the Roman empire and is said to have raised the port of Kalliena (Kalyāṇa) to the rank of a regular mart.[214] This Elder Saraganus is commonly supposed to be identical with one of these Sātakarṇis.[215] The Sātakarṇi of all these records is commonly identified with the first king of this name mentioned in the Purāṇic texts, and is styled Sātakarṇi I.[216] However, Mirashi is right in pointing out that a short reign of just ten years[217] is too brief for a career with so very diverse activities and achievements and therefore feels that the Purāṇic compilers have erred in it.[218] But we are quite convinced that it is not necessary to blame the Purāṇakāras for it, and we should use our discretion as warranted by our sources. And we feel that there was only one early Sātavāhana emperor called Sātakarṇi with a long rule lasting fifty-six years commensurate with these diverse attainments. If he was the first Sātakarṇi, son of Kṛishṇa, we must presume that he had a reign of fifty-six years,[219] or alternatively he and his two successors were actually collaterals jumbled up with the main line and that the second Sātakarṇi was the only early king of this name, and to him alone all the coins hitherto attributed to the two kings called Sātakarṇi I and II must be ascribed. This would also be in accordance with the shorter chronology for the Sātavāhanas which is the only one warranted by the combined literary and archaeological data and adopted in these pages, for we have only a little over seven decades between the close of Kṛishṇa's reign and the commencement of that of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi which would not be adequate enough to accommodate even these four reigns not to speak of other reigns some of which are well-documented by other sources. In case the first alternative is conceded, which is equally likely, he was the son of Kṛishṇa as stated in the Purāṇas, and the arguments advanced against it and in favour of the suggestion that he was really a son of Simuka himself[220] have nothing to commend themselves. Whichever viewpoint is accepted, it would provide a long reign of fifty-six years enough to accommodate the numerous events highlighted above.

He is often called Śrī-Sātakarṇi by historians only because he is so mentioned in the Purāṇas, but *śrī* here as in several other names[221] is only an honorific used due to metrical emxigencies and not a part of the name.

His long reign probably covered *c.* 12 BC-AD44.

Sātakarṇi's Successors

We learn from the larger Nāṇeghāṭ inscription elaborating, *inter alia*, numerous Vedic sacrifices observed by Sātakarṇi and his queen Nāgavaradāyinī or Nāganikā that the former was succeeded by their son, obviously elder, Vedisiri (Skt. Vediśrī),[222] who is, however, unknown to the Purāṇas which instead speak of Lambodara as Sātakarṇi's son and successor with a reign lasting eighteen[223] years.[224] The Purāṇas refer to several kings following Lambodara and

preceding Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi only some of whom are known independently. They include the following:

Name	*Reign*
Āpīlaka, Lambodara's son[225]	12 years
Meghasvāti[226]	18 years
Svāti[227]	18 years
Skandasvāti[228]	7 years
Mṛigendra Svātikarṇa[229]	3 years
Kuntala Svātikarṇa[230]	8 years
Svātivarṇa[231]	1 year
Pulomāvi[232]	36[233] or 24[234] years
Arishṭakarṇa[235]	25 years[236]
Hāla[237]	5 years[238]
Mantalaka or Pattalaka[239]	5 years
Purīndrasena[240] or Purikasheṇa[241]	21 years[242]
Sundara Sātakarṇi[243]	1 year
Chakora Sātakarṇi[244]	6 months
Śivasvāti[245]	28 years

The historicity of only a few of these rulers of the longer list is vouched for by other sources. These are Āpilaka, Kuntala, Hāla, Sundara (or Sunandana) and perhaps Meghasvāti and Sivaśvāti. As shown above, Āpīlaka, described as the son of Lambodara, belonged to the Kosalā branch of the dynasty and all of his coins (three) reported so far were minted at Mallār. None of his records, inscriptions or coins, has been reported from anywhere else.

Kuntala Svātikarṇa (correctly Sātakarṇi) is mentioned in the *Kāmasūtra* (II. 7. 28) in an erotic context, and even his very name speaks of his local character. The Jayamaṅgalā commentary of Yaśodhara informs us that he owed this name to his birth in the Kuntala country.[246] He apparently ruled over Kuntala comprising the southern part of Maharashtra and the adjacent northern region of Karnataka and whiled away his time in sensual diversions.

Hāla's existence is vouched for by an anthology of seven hundred Prakrit stanzas (Gāthās in Āryā metre) now called popularly *Gāhāsattasaī* (Sanskrit *Gāthāsaptaśatī*) but known anciently as *Kosha*, viz. 'a treasure' of stanzas and is so mentioned by eminent ancient literateurs including Bāṇa,[247] Uddyotanasūri,[248] and Abhinanda[249] as well as in the colophon of the work itself.[250] Pītāmbara's[251] and Gaṅgādhara's[252] scholia on it also call it by

this name. While interpolating to it in later times, care was generally taken to ensure that an equal number of stanzas were dropped so that the number remained static at seven hundred which gave it the now popular nomenclature. These stanzas were selected out of a much larger number and they give excellent glimpses of contemporary rural life, especially its emotive facets. The eposode about him detailed in a later Prakrit poem *Līlāvaī.* thouth highly exciting, is not quite reliable. Most probably he had nothing to do with the imperial line of the dynasty, and there is some reason to hold that he, like the preceding chief, was a member of the Kuntala branch.

The actuality of Sundara is clearly vouched for by the author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, who avers that 'after Sandanes[253] became its (of Kalliena) master its trade was put under severest restrictions; for if Greek vessels even by accident enter its ports a guard is put on board and they are taken to Barygaza.'[254] This should suffice to show that these ports which had become lawful and lucrative marts under the Elder Saraganus (Sātakarṇi) had become quite insecure due primarily to the growing ascendancy of -Kgkshaharāta power under the powerful energetic Nahapāna.

Attempts have been made to isolate the monetary issues of Meghasvāti and of Śivasvāti, father of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi. V.A. Smith[255] and E.J. Rapson[256] read the fragmentary legend on some square lead specie from the Kṛishṇā-Godāvrī region of coastal Andhra Pradesh as *[ghasadasa]* and suggested the equation of the issuer of these coins with Meghasvāti or Saṅgha of the Purāṇas. [257] However, till a few years back when the existence of pre-Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi ruling family with the names of its members terminating in *sada* was not known, it was commonly held that *sada* was either an abbreviated form of Sātakarṇi or a Prakritised form of some other name. But now that the same region has yielded coins of Sada kings datable to the period prior to Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi's occupation of coastal Andhra, it would be more reasonable to ascribe this coin to a Sada chief who has, of course, yet to be identified.

The present author had read somewhat doubtfully *Siva-dasa* on a rectangular copper coin[258] from Bhokardan (Aurangābād district) excavations and proposed the identification of its issuer with Śivasvāti, father of the great Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi.[259] Howe1ver, as the legend itself has not been accommodated in its entirety on the coin, it is impossible to be sure on this point.

According to the longer list of Andhra-Sātavāhana rulers found in some of the Purāṇic texts, no less than sixteen rulers flourished between Sātakarṇi and Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi. And as according to the chronological framework proposed in these pages the latter ascended the throne by AD 60 at the latest and the former's reign ended by AD 44, a brief spell of just about sixteen years is available to us to accommodate all of them who could be adjusted within this short span only on the assumption that all of them ruled for just a

year on the average which is not possible at all. As we have shown, there is reason to believe that at least a few of them were members of the regional branches of the dynasty, and many more may have been so. Then there must have been internecine conflicts and disputed successions not unreasonably often encouraged by the ascendant Kshaharāta power. This must have more often than not resulted in extremely brief reigns lasting one year or just a half as we see from the above list. Then, in addition to the aforesaid Purāṇic chiefs, there were other members of the imperial line whose existence is revealed by coins issued by them, viz. Kochhiputa and Kauśikīputra Sātakarṇi, who flourished during this period, as shown above.

Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi

The next Andhra king named in all the Purāṇas is the great Gautamīputra,[260] and from now on the Purāṇtic texts are generally unanimous and more reliable as compared to the preceding period. All the kings hereafter are attested independently as well. And this is as it aught to be. For, there is explicit proof that the reign of Yajña Sātakarṇi marked the conclusion of the Purāṇic account there up to and the portion thereafter was drafted subsequently. Several manuscripts of the *Matsya* speak of Yajña ruling in his ninth year in the present tense as against the normal prophetic vein (viz. future tense). The line in question runs as follows:

Nava varshāṇi Yajñaśrīḥ kurute Sātakarṇikaḥ[261]

The gap between the reigns of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and his descendant Yajña Sātakarṇi was not long enough to occasion major distortions.

The second part of the king's name, the actual name really, Sātkarṇi, is left unnoticed, probably because during the reign of Yajña, or at least its early part, he was more well-known as Gautamīputra even though Yajña was also a Gautamīputra. And in so far as the extant inscriptional evidence is concerned, he was the first Andhra-Satavāhana king to use a metronymic.[262] But it is very likely that some other earlier Sātavāhana beings known hitherto only from their coins had also employed such metronymics, viz. Kochhīputa and Kosikīputa. That the king underr reference was actually a Gautamīputra, born of a queen of the Gautama *gotra* is attested by his own inscriptions which style him Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi[263] as well as by the Nāsik inscription of his son Vāsishthīputra Puḷumāvi's 19th year which supplies the additional detail that his mother was a Gotamī (of Gautama *gotra)* and her personal name was Balasiri (Balaśrī) who prided in her son's great military and other attainments.[264] He is given a reign of twenty-one years in all the Purāṇas,[265] but the *Brahmāṇḍa* manuscript consulted by Rapson gives for its Yantramati (? Gautamīputra) thirty-four years.[266] But that twenty-one years cannot be correct is clearly demonstrated by one of his Nāsik inscriptions put up in his twenty-fourth year.[267] It is not impossible that he continued to rule for a few years thereafter, and so he may be assigned a reign lasting about thirty years, viz. after AD 60-90.[268]

Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi's Sons

Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi's son and successor was one who is mentioned in the Purāṇas as Pulomā and by such other names.[269] He is evidently identical with Vāsishṭīhputra Puḷumāvi known from his fairly numerous inscriptions scattered over Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh and also from a vast quantity of silver and base metal specie. The Purāṇas give him twenly-eight years' rule,[270] and it is supported by his latest inscription, viz. Kārle inscription put up in his twenty-fourth year.[271] His reign may therefore be dated *c.* AD 91-118.

After Vāsishṭhiputra Puḷumaṿi the Purāṇas mention a few other kings who, going by their common metronymic met with in their inscriptions and on their coins, were related to each other as uterine brothers. These include Sātakarṇi, Śivaśri Pulomā and Śivaskandha Sātakarṇi.[272] From these epigraphs and coins we know that they were all Vāsishṭhīputras or sons born of a queen belonging to Vasishṭha *gotra.* Of these, the first known from an inscription of his unnamed queen at Kānherī,[273] is mentioned only in a single manuscript of the *Vāyu* designated *eVā* by Pargiter[274] and proves that sometimes a single manuscript's reading is correct and dependable. This king is also known from a large number of coins including silver portrait ones.[275] He is given twenty-nine years' reign which may be placed in *c.* AD 119-47. He was a son-in-law of the Kārdamaka Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman I with whom he got involved in a sanguinary conflict and was worsted twice but not killed due to the closeness of relation as averred in the latter's Girñār *praśasti.*[276] These facts go well with the date proposed here.

This Sātakarṇi was followed by Śivaśri Puḷumāvi regarding whom there is a lot of confusion in the Purāṇas as well as among modern historians, epigraphists and numismatists. In a vast majority of the *Matsya* manuscripts he is mentioned as Śivaśrī Pulomā and given a reign lasting seven years.[277] Most of the manuscripts of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* also name Śivaśri, but without suffixing Pulomā to it. All except only one manuscript (termed *e*Vā by Pargiter) of the Vāyu Purāṇa omit all the names after Gautmīputra and prior to Yajñaśri (viz. Yajña Sātakarṇi). And the same is the case with the *Brahmāṇḍa.* All the names after Sundara (or Sunandana) Sātakarṇi are drpped in the *Bhāgavata.* In view of these facts it is not to be wondered if this name is conspicuous by absence in most of the *Vāyu* manuscripts, *Brahmāṇḍa* and *Bhāgavata* which have dropped several other names as well. The *e*Vā manuscript of the *Vāyu,* however, mentions him as Śirasīputra Āvi which is obviously an error for Śivaśrī Puḷumāvi.[278] He is evidently the same as Vāsishṭhīputra Śivaśrī Puḷumāvi (Vāsiṭhiputa Sivasiri Puḷumāvi in Prakrit) of many a coin and inscription, the metronymic showing that he was a couterine brother of the two preceding Vāsishthīputras, evidently younger.[279] His own Vanavāsī (Uttara Kannaḍa district, Karnataka) inscription refers to him as Vāsiṭhiputra Sivasiri Puḷumāvi and aims at recording the execution of memorial sculptured stone (*chhāyā-prastara*) of his unnamed chief queen (*mahādevī*) who had apparently passed away at the place.[280] A private lithic inscription of his reign found recently at Sannati (Gaubargā district,

Karnataka) registering some pious act of a private person spells his name as beginning with Pudu instead of the usual Puḷu.[281] His base metal specie have been found, *inter alia*, from Brahmapurī (Chandrapur district),[282] Tarhāḷā (Akolā district)[283] and Wāṭegāon (Sānglī district)[284] in Maharashtra and from the Kṛishṇā-Godāvarī region of Andhra Pradesh.[285] His silver portrait coins have been reported from excavations at Dhūlikaṭṭa (Karīmnagar district, Andhra Pradesh)[286] and from a personal collection at Indore in Madhya Pradesh[287] and must have hailed from a sātavāhana site. Koṇdapur in the Maḍak district of Andhra Padesh has given us a terracotta proof piece of the reverse of his silver coin, showing thereby that it was a mint-site for his silver portrait coins.[288]

V.V. Mirashi has recently attempted a denial of the very existence of this king and suggested that Śivaśrī happened to be merely an honorific and that the coins with the legend *Vāsiṭhiputasa Sivasiri-Puḷumāvisa*, like those with the legend without this honorific which were issued alternatively, must be ascribed to Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi.[289] The same scholar had earlier noticed the coins of Śivaśrī Puḷumāvi and rightly attributed them to him.[290] Later while publishing the wāṭegāon hoard containing his coins he rejected his own earlier and correct attribution and insisted on ascribing these coins to Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi instead of Vāsishṭhīputra Śivaśrī whose identity he now totally denied. The reason for this total role-reversal was the fear that this addition would result in raising the number of the Sātavāhana rulers to thirty-one whereas the Purāṇas clearly aver that the number totalled thirty, which to him had become sacrosanct at that time. The two aforesaid portrait coins, have, however, clinched the issue as the portraits on these and on those of his eldest brother Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi are demonstrably those of two distinct personages and cannot be confused for one another.[291]

Though the name of the next king is often spelt as Śivaskandha Sātakarṇi, the first part of the name is actually Skanda,[292] Śiva being in this case only a title of respect.[293] He is identical with Khada (Sanskrit Skanda) Sātakani (Sātakarni) of fairly numerous coins.[294] He is mentioned often in coin-legends as Vāsishthīputra which should demonstrate that he was related to the preceding three kings as a younger uterine brother. The statement in the reconstituted text that he was the son (*asy-ātmajah*)[295] must therefore be discarded as incorrect and untenable. It is likely that it was intended to go with the description of the next king, Yajñaśrī Sātakarṇika, who is mentioned next. The reconstituted text intended to specify his years of reign as can be inferred from the concluding word of the line, viz. *samāḥ*, which, however, remained unspecified. Pargiter also felt the same way and proposed to modify the concluding portion of the *Matsya* as reconstituted by him to *bhāvī tasmāt trayo* (sic) *samāh*,[296] thus giving him a brief three-year rule. A manuscript of the *Vāyu* (eVā) actually has *bhavishyati samās trayaḥ*, he would be (king) for three years.[297] However, a comparison of his portraits on his silver specie'[297a] would show that the reign allotted to him in the eVā manuscript and supposed to have been given in the *Matsya* also is too brief and should be about 15 years from AD 156 to *c.* 170.

It has been suggested by some scholars that following Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi's demise the Sātavāhana empire was partitioned among his brothers. They offered several suggestions by way of identifying the areas under them primarily on the basis of the provenances of their specie.[298] These views are, however, quite untenable. For, coins are found from time to time and kings earlier unrepresented by them are now known to have minted quite a lot. It would be obvious by comparing Rapson's work on Andhra-Satāvāhana specie and some modern writings on the subject like those of I.K. Sarma and Mala Datta which, too, are no longer representative of the present advanced state of our knowledge on the subject, and this is bound to be with all future works which will stand in need of constant updating. To cite just one instance, prior to the find of Tarhāḷā hoard no coins of Skanda Sātakarṇi were known and all our knowledge regarding him was based exclusively on what the Purāṇas aver, and today we have many more coins of his including white metal series. And today we know of the coins of most of the Sātavāhana rulers of the imperial line till its very end from localities spread over most of their traditional area including Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharasthra and they afford no evidence of a split. It is therefore best, at least tentatively as of now, to hold that all the successors of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi of the imperial line named in the Purāṇas exercised sway over an undivided empire.

Yajña Sātakarṃi

The next Andhra-Sātavāhana emperor named in the Purāṇas is one who is called Yajnaśrī.[299] Sātakarṇika[300] or Sātakarṇi.[301] The correct spelling of the first part of the name met with in his numerous inscriptions and coins is only Yajña, the following *śrī* being just an honorific, which could have been either prefixed or suffixed to the name of both of which we have several instances. The change of place here is evidently due to metrical exigencies.[302] In fact, the employment of this term of respect is dictated only by considerstions of metre and no special significance aught to be seen in it as done by some writers. Nothing is said about his relationship with the preceding monarch (Skanda Sātakarṇi), but the two may have been related as son and father respectively. We feel that the expression *asy-ātmajaḥ* (his son) met with in connection with the latter may have been employed in connection with Yajña Sātakarṇi but later changed place owing to faulty manuscript tradition. The *Matsya*[303] and some of the manuscripts of the *Vāyu* accord him a twenty-nine year rule while the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the rest of the *Vāyu* manuscripts reduce it to nineteen.[304] But that former aught to be the correct one is demonstrated by his epigraphic records the latest of which is dated in his twenty-seventh year.[305] He probably ruled during *c.* AD 171-199.

He is referred to in his numerous epigraphs[306] and legends on many of his coins[307] as Gautamīputra, evidently because he was born of a queen belonging to the Gautama *gotra* (Gautamī) and was the last great member of the dynasty.

Vijaya

According to the Purāṇas, Yajña was followed on the throne by Vijaya, who is given a six-year rule.[308] Like Yajña, he is styled as Gautamīputra in the only known record of his reign from Nāgarjunakoṇḍa which is dated in his sixth regnal year.[309] The employment of the common metronymic should probably imply that the two (Yajña and Vijaya) were uterine brothers. He obviously founded the city of Vijayapurī, ancient name of modern Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, where an individual donor executed the pious act recorded in the only known record of his reign. Later it became the capital of the Ikshvākus, who followed the Sātavāhanas shortly after in the Eastern Deccan. As he ruled just for six years, his rule may be placed in *c.* AD 200-205.

Chaṇḍa Sātakarṇi

The next king was Vijaya's son whose name is spelt in the Purāṇas as Chaṇḍaśri[310] or Daṇḍasrī,[311] viz. Chaṇḍa or Daṇḍa, the following *śri* being a title of honour. The *Matsya*, *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata* which spell the king's name as Chaṇḍa or so aver that he ruled for ten years,[312] while in the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* where we get the spelling Daṇḍa we find a much shorter reign lasting only three years allotted to him.[313] The correctness of the former spelling is attested by a short six-line inscription of this king's reign which spells his name as Chaṁḍasāti where Sātakarṇi is found abbreviated to Sāti. This record, found at a place known as Koḍavalī located near Pīṭhāpuram (ancient Pishṭapura) in the Godāvarī district of Andhra Pradesh, applies to him the title *Svāmin (sāmi* in inscription) and the metronymic Vāsishṭhīputra.[314] Apparently Vijaya Sātakarṇī had his chief queen of the Vasishṭha *gotra*, and Chaṇḍa Sātakarṇi was born of her. This is quite significant for genealogical purposes as will be shown in the sequel. The epigraph also contained a date; but unfortunately the figure for the year has now become rather indistinct and has been deciphered differently: as 2 by H. Krishna Sastry who edited it originally[315] and dobutfully as 11 by V.V. Mirashi.[316] It is difficult to make out the figure certainly from the facsimile; however, as the reading 11 goes against both the periods (10 or 3), it is better to accept at least tentatively the former reading. As the correct form of the name is found in the *Matsya*, *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata*, the regnal period given by them, viz. ten years, may also be accepted as correct. Accordingly, he may be placed in *c.* AD 206-15.

Vijaya Sātakarṇi

There was perhaps a uterine brother of Chaṇḍa Sātakarṇi who appears to have ruled but is ignored by the Purāṇas. He is Vāsishṭhiputra Vijaya Sātakarṇi known from a unique silver portrait coin found rather recently which clearly establishes his rule as an emperor. He may have had a short reign of about ten years which may be dated in *c.* AD 216 to 225. The reason for ignoring him may have been something like occupying the throne unlawfully or just due to the copyist's inadvertence.[317]

Pulumāvi

At the end of teh Purāṇic list of Andhra-Sātavāhana kings stands Pulumāvi or Puḷumāvi,[318] and he is explicity styled so (*antya*) in the Purāṇas.[319] The duration of his rule is unanimously given as seven years.[320] His rule may therefore be placed from *c.* AD 226 to 232, when the imperial line of the dynasty came to a close and was replaced by other ruling families which earlier owed allegiance to them.

Two of the inscriptions of his reign are known, and in at least one of them he is styled Vāsishṭhīputra[321] like the preceding two monarchs, showing that they were uterine brothers. Both these records hail from Karnataka: one found quite some time back at Aḍonī in the Ballāry district and the other reported comparatively recently from Vāsana or Haḷe-Vaṣana in the Dhārwāḍ district. The first inscription was published long ago by V.S. Sukthankar who attributed it to Vāsishthīputra Puḷumāvi, son and successor of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi only because he read its date as the eighth year whereas the last homonymous Sātavāhana ruler of this name is accorded a reign lasting only seven years.[322] The date has now been correctly read as 6, and there is now nothing to bar its ascription to the latter. Not only there is nothing contrary to its assignment, there is something positive against its attribution to the great Gautamīputra's homonymous son. In the style of some later South Indian inscriptions, it begins the description of the reigning king with the expression *raño Sātavāhanām,*[323] which by itself should have sufficed for this conclusion. We have some indications of a close relationship between Chaṇḍa and Puḷumāvi, who followed him on the throne, in the Vāsana inscription: it refers to Chaṇḍaśiva as residing in the abode of gods, ie dead.[324] Another form of the king's name appears to have been Puḷahāmavi which is met with on some coins in the Tarhāḷā hoard.[325]

After the imperial line of the Andhra-Sātavāhanas had gone out of power some members of the dynasty continued to rule over some outlying areas including Vidarbha. Three of the Vidarbha Sātavāhana monarchs, viz. Kumbha, Saka and Karṇa, all styled Sātakarṇi, are known from their coins included in the Tarhāḷā hoard and continued to rule till the advent of the Vākāṭakas around end-third century AD.[236] However, they are naturally not named in the Purāṇas whose vision had been concentrated from Gautamīputra onward only to the imperial members.

Andhrabhṛityas

We may close our discussion of the Purāṇic data on the Andhra-Sātavāhanas with a passing reference to two of their former vassals who might have contributed to their fall and assumed soverign power thereafter and find mention in the Purānas. They were Andhra and Ābhīras. According to the *Matsya, Vāyu* and *Brahmaṇḍa*, after the Andhra rule had come to a close, scions of their vassals *(teshām bhrity-ānvayāḥ)* including seven Andhras and ten Ābhīras became kings,[327] while the *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata* aver that seven Ābhīras who were *Andhra-bhṛityas* (servants of the Andhras) became monarchs.[328] The latter do not refer to the seven

Andhras who followed the Andhra Sātavāhanas. Both the groups of the Purāṇas are one at including the Ābhīras among the successors of the Andhra-Sātavāhanas; but while the former give their number as ten, the latter give it as seven, there being thus some discrepancy and confusion. However, there is no doubt that the Ābhīras succeeded the Sātavāhanas in Maharashtra with their headquarters at Nāsik or Govardhana as would follow from an inscription of the ninth year of the reign of the Ābhīra king Īśvarasena at Nāsik.[329] The record is supposed to have been dated in the Kalachuri-Chedi era commencing AD 248-49, the actual year being ninth. We do not know, however, if he had some other members of the family to precede/succeed him for want of necessary data. The seven Andhra kings said to have followed the Sātavāhanas were apparently the Ikshvākus of the Kṛishṇā-Godāvarī region with Vijayapurī (Nāgārjunakoṇḍa) for their capital who flourished during third-fourth centuries AD and are known from a fairly large number of inscriptions. From their description as Andhra they appear to have belonged to the same stock as the Sātavāhanas. They are often designated Śrīparvatīya Andhras after Śrīparvata which was an important politico-religious centre during their time.[330]

What is of crucial interest form our viewpoint is that both these powers are explicity described as 'servants of the Andhras': the Ābhīras are clearly called *Andhra-bhritya* in the *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata*, while both they and the Ikshvākus are described as 'their (Andhraś) servants' in the other texts. There is thus no doubt that the term *Andhra-bhṛitya* refers not to the taken as a *shashṭhītatpurusha* compound.

Appendices

The paper ends with two appendices. Appendix I gives in a tabular form the chronology and tentative order of succession of the Andhra-Sātavāhanas following our interpretation of the Purāṇic data and historical reconstruction. The second Appendix is a reproduction of the dynastic text of the Purāṇas bearing on the Andhra-Sātavāhanas as well as of that immediately preceding and following it as reconstructed by Pargiter in his *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* (*DKA*). The serial numbers of pages of the original are given within brackets beside those of this work. It is reproduced without any alteration only in order to facilitate referencing and cross-checking. Hopefully, these appendices will be found helpful by the discerning readers.

Appendix - I

SĀTAVĀHANAS : CHRONOLGY AND ORDER OF SUCCESSION

Chhimuka (Simuka) Sātavahana *c.* 52-*c.* 30 BC ——— Kṛishṇa *c.* 29 — 12 BC

Sātakarṇi[1] *c.* 12 BC — c. AD 44

Veḍiśrī[2]

Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi *c.* AD 61-90

Vāsiṣṭhīputra Puḷumāvi *c.* AD. 91-118	Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi *c.* AD 119-47	Vāsishṭhīputra Śivaśrī Puḷumāvi *c.* AD 148-55	Vāsishṭhīputra Skanda Sātakarṇi[3] *c.* AD 156-70
		Gautamīputra Yajña Sātakarṇi *c.* AD 171-99 ———	Gautamīputra Vijaya Sātakarṇi *c.* AD 200-205
	Vāsishṭhīputra Chaṇḍa Sātakarṇi c. AD 206-15 ———	Vāsishṭhīputra Vijaya Sātakarṇi *c.* AD 216-25 ———	Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi *c.* AD 226-32

1. We do not believe in the existence of two kings named Sātakarṇi.
2. He is known only from the larger Nāṇeghāṭ inscription and there is nothing to determine the length of his reign. Between Sātakarṇi and Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi the Purāṇas mention several kings including Lambodara, Āpilaka, Meghasvāti, Svāti, Skandasvāti, Mṛigendra, Kuntala, Svātikarṇa, Pulomāvi, Arishṭakarṇa, Hāla, Mantalaka or Pattalaka, Purīndrasena, Sundara Sātakarṇi, Chakora and Śivasvāti. Of these, some of the kings were purely local in character and existence of only a few can be proved otherwise.
3. Basing on the common metronymic it is commonly supposed that these were uterine brothers; but other explanations are also possible.

Appendix - II

PURĀṆIC TEXTS ON ANDHRA SĀTAVĀHANAS

catvāras tu[29] dvijā hy ete[30]	bhāvyāḥ praṇata-sāmantāś
Kaṇvā[31] bhokṣyanti vai[32] mahim	catvāriṁśac ca pañca ca
catvāriṁśat pañca[33] c-aiva[34]	
bhokṣyant-imāṁ vasundharām	
ete[35] praṇata-sāmantā	
bhaviṣyā dhārmikāś ca ye	
yeṣām[36] paryāya[37]-kāle tu[38]	teṣām paryāya-kāle tu[39]
bhumir Āndhrān gamisyati[40]	bhūr Andhrāṇām[41] bhaviṣyati[43].

Andhras.

*Text–*AMt *273*, 1–17a; *A*Vā 99, 348-358[a]; Bḍ iii, *74*, 106[b]-170.
*Corresp. passages–C*Vṣ iv, *24*, 12-13; *G*Bh xii, *1*, 22-28.

This dynasty is given in full by the Matsya, while the accounts in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa are far from perfect. The Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu give a list of the kings though not completely, with some details at the beginning and end.

The defects in the MSS will appear from the following notices of the kings; but *e*Vā, which stands midway between the Matsya and Vāyu, has misplaced the first portion down to Svāti, inserting it long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāṇi: *hp*Mt have nothing; *h*Vā omits II. 1-21.

[29] So *j*Mt. Mt genly *catvāriniśd; bdn* Mt °śa: see Appendix I, § iv.

[30] But *j*Mt omits *hy*; *n*Mt omits *hy ete*: *b*Mt *cite* (for *c-aite*).

[31] So Mt genly : *Cfgm Mt Kāṇvā*; *n*Mt *Kanvā*; *e*Mt *Kāvo*; *i*Mt *Kagvo*.

[32] In *l*Mt crp: *j*Mt reads this half line, *bhokṣyante pṛthivīm imām*.

[33] So Mt genly : *b*Mt *°riṁśa naghaṁ (or nadyaṁ)*

[34] In *j*Mt *c-aite*.

[35] So Mt genly : *j*Mt *gate*.

[36] *In bedefgjkn* MT *teṣām*.

[37] In *l*Mt *payoja*.

[38] So Mt genly : *e*Mt *kāleṣu*.

[39] So Vā genly : *CI*Vā *kāleṣu*. *bd* Vā (for 8-Andhrā?) *bh°*.

[40] So Mt genly ; *f*Mt *An°* : *g*Mt Andhrāṁ, cMt °rā. This half line is in a²*bn* Mt *bhūmir (n. mūmir) iddhā bhaviṣyati; l*Mt *munir ıbh°* (short); *j*Mt *bhūmih sāṁdrā*

[41] All Vā readings are crp, and this is an *emendation. Bhūr is represented* thus, a³a⁴*Vā tur; Ca²gjklVā tar;* a¹ Vā *ter* ; *fm*Vā *star*; bdVā *ster* (altered to *ter* in d). Andhrāṇām, or rathr its Pkt form *Andhrāṇa*, is represented thus, a¹ fgm Vā *Andhā nu*; a³a⁴*bd* Vā *Andhā nu; Ca²jklVā Andhrā tu*. But e Vā has Mt reading crp, *bhumiv-Antāngamisyati*.

[42] Bd and Bh have not got the concluding lines (5 in Mt, 3 in Vā). Bd. has-

Kaṇvāuyanās tu catvāraś catvāriṁśac capañca ca
sama bhokṣyanti pṛthivim punar Andhrān gamiṣyati.

Bh similarly-

Kāṇvāyanā* ime bhumiṁ eatvārimśac capańca ca
śatáni triṇi bhokṣyanti varṣāṇāṁ' ca Kalauyuge:

where* *jl*Bh *Kan°*; ᵗ_q*Bhvarṣāṇi*. Vṣsays-

ete *Kāṇvāyanāś* catvāraḥ pañca-catvāriṁśad-varṣāni bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti:*

where* _cV, *Kaṇv⁰*, *kVṣ Kāśv°*.

ANDHRAS

The Vāyu, Brahamāṇda, Bhāgavata, and Viṣṇu all say there were 30 kings, though they do not give 30 names. The Vā MSS name only 17, 18, or 19, and *e*Vā which is the fullest names only 25; Brahmāṇḍa only 17; Bhāgavata 23; and Viṣnu 24, or 22 and 23 in two MSS. The Matsys says there were 19 kings, but 3 MSS (*dgn)* actually name 30, and the others vary from 28 to 21. Before noticing the differences in them and the other authorities, it will be convenient to set out the list of the kings, of whom 30 are clearly named; and 30 is not doubt the correct number.

1. Simuka
2. Kṛṣṇa
3. Sri-Śātakarṇi (Śri-Mallak°)
4. Pūrṇotsaṇga
5. Ṣkandhastambhi
6. Sātkarṇi
7. Lambodara
8. Āpilaka (Divilaka)
9. Meghasvāti
10. Svāti
11. Skandasvāti
12. Mṛgendra
13. Kuntala
14. Svātivarṇa
15. Pulomāvi (Padumān)
16. Ariṣṭakarṇa
17. Hāla
18. Mantalaka or Pattalaka
19. Purindrasena
20. Sundara Śātakarṇi
21. Cakora
22. Śivasvāti
23. Gautamiputra
24. Pulomā
24a. Sātkarṇi
25. Sivaśri
26. Śivaskandha
27. Yajñaśri
28. Vijay
29. Caṇḍaśri
30. Pulomāvi

The lists in the MSS stand thus, omitting at present no. 24a who is mentioned only in *e*Vā. Mt MSS name the following (*fgm* Mt calling no. 15 Pulomāvi a second Mehasvāti), the numbers within brackets denoting those who are omitted: – *CGV* have 27 kings (nos. 2, 5, 15 omitted); a^1 a^2 a^3 a^4 28 (5, 15); *b* 27 (9, 20, 22); *c*27 (2, 5, 20) ; *e* 25 (2, 5, 20, 23, 24); *f* 27 (24, 25, 29); *j* 24 (5, 7, 8, 18, 19, 29); k 21 (5, 9-11, 20-23, 29); *l*20 (2, 5, 9, 12, 13, 20-24); *m* 27 (1, 2, 5): n 29 (20); *d* 30 and repeats 6-10; *g* 30 and repeats 10-14 and 15 (with correct name Pulomāvi): *hp* Mt have nothing. All Vā MSS other than *eh* Vā, name nos. 1-3, 6-8, 15-23, 27-30; except that Ca^2a^3f omit no.21; *k* no. 8; *l* 8, 21; *m* 21, 30: *h* has lost the first part and begins with no. 19: a^1a^4 apparently insert no. 8, twice; *m* repeats 3, 6 after no. 8. All these Vā name no. 20 Sundara merely as Sātakarṇi.

But *e*Vā is peculiar and its list is broken up into three sets. It begins thus, nos. 11, 18, 19, 20 (calling him Sundara), 21; then reverting mentions 12-15, 24a, 25-30; and long afterwards (see p. 35) names 1-4, 6-10 (corrupting no. 9's name). It thus omits 5, 16, 17, 22-24, yet makes its total 25 by including 24a, who is considered further on.

Bḍ names 1-3, 6, 8, 15-20, 22, 23, 27-30. Vṣ mentions 1-4, 6-9, 15-30; but *b*Vṣ omits 4, 6; *k*Vṣ no. 21; *l*Vṣ, 28-29. Bh nams 1-4, 7-9, 15-20; but *bt*Bh have nothing.

All the authorities keep the order of the kings as in the above list, except that 5 Mt MSS show three discrepancies. Two are small, namely, (1) *d*Mt mentions 6-10 and immediately repeats them; (2) *n*Mt inverts nos. 5 and 6, and mentions no. 19 twice, first after no. 13 and again in his proper place. The third discrepancy concerns nos. 10-15: *g*Mt names these in their place and repeats them after no. 29; and *bl*Mt omit them from their place and insert hem (*l* omitting 12, 13) after no. 29. These discrepancies appear to be mere mistakes due to carelessness, or to lacunae or disarrangements of leaves in the MSS copied.

Every king in the list (except 24a) is mentioned by most of the MSS of at least two Purāṇas, except nos. 5, 10-14. No. 5 occurs only in Mt, but 5 MSS name him. Nos. 10-14 are mentioned only by Mt and *e*Vā : but no. 14 appears in them all; nos. 10, 11 in all except *k*Mt; and nos. 12, 13 in all

except *l*Mt. They seem to be genuine, and help to constitute the total number 30. The general consensus then establishes the number, names, and order in the above list.

No. 24*a*, Sātakarṇi, mentioned only in eVā, is not no. 20, who is called Śātakarṇi merely in all other Vā MSS and in Bd. for Mt, Vā, Bḍ, and *e*Vā agree that the latter reigned only one year (p. 41, l. 23), while the description of the former in eVā is 1.28 on p.42, and assigns 29 years to him. There is no line like it except 1. 32 about Yajñaśri, but he is not apparently Yajñaśri whom *e*Vā mentions in his proper place. According to the *e*Vā list he should come presumably either immediately after no. 15, or immediately before no. 25 Śivaśri. The only indication I can find bearing upon this puzzle occurs in lVṣ which regards Sātakarṇi Śivaśri as two, (1) Sātakarṇi (2) Śivaśri (see p. 42, note[1]), and so places a Sātakarṇi exactly in one of the positions required by *e*Vā. If this Sātakarṇi then be real, his place would be 24*a*. A line found in only one MS should not be rejected straight away (see Introdn. § 3 1), hence I have included him in the list in that position by 1. 28; but, since his existence is vouched for by no other authority and he would raise the number of the kings to 31, that line is enclosed in brackets. If he is genuine, we may suppose that the total 30 is a round number.

Many of the kings bore the name Śātakarṇi, and it is spelt in many ways, the first part as *Śāti, Śānta, Śānti, Śita* (with *s* often instead of ś in those forms), and the latter part as *karṇi, karṇa, koṇa, varṇa*, &c. It is needless to state all such variations in the text and notes, and the form *Śātakarni* is adopted because it agrees best with the Pkt form *Śātakarni* generally found on coins. The names *Śvātikarṇa* and *Svạtivarụa* occur sometimes and seen to be merely variants of it (see notes [57, 61, 63]). All these forms may obviously be Sanskritizations of that one Pkt name.

Prof. Rapson's 'Indian Coins, Andhras, &c.' elucidate this dynasty partially. I have not attempted, as it is not my function here, to identify the names in this list with those mentioned in inscriptions and on coins, except those of the first three kings who seem clear. The first king, whose correct name was Simuka Sátaváhana, is mentioned in Lüders' List of Brāhmi inscriptions, no. 1113 (Epig. Ind. x, Appendix); the second Kṛṣṇa or Kanha in *id.* no. 1144; and the third Śri-Sātakarṇi in *id.* nos.346, 1114. In other inscriptions the following kings are mentioned—Gotamīputa Siri Sātakaṇi, nos. 1123, 1125; Siri Sivamaka Sada, no. 1279; Sati (=Śakti?) Sirimata, nos. 1112; Vāsithīputa Siri Puḷumāvi nos. 1106, 1124 (and probably 1100): Siri Pulumāvi, no. 1248: Vāsithiputa Siri Puḷumāyi, nos. 1122-3; Vāsaṭhiputa Catarrrapana Satakani, no. 1120; Gotamīputa Siri Sātakarṇi, no. 1123; and Sadakaṇi, no 1125; Sivakhada (or Sadakhada) Nāga siri, no. 1186: Gotamīputra Siri Yaña, nos. 987, 1024, 1146, 1340: Vasiṭhīputra Caḍasāta, no. 1341; adn Māḍhariputa Sirivira Purisadata of the Ikhākhus, nos. 1202-4 (see note[78]).

It may be noted that one line in certain Mt MSS differs from all the others in its expression namely, 1.30 about Yajńaśrī (see note thereto). He is spoken of there in the present tense, *kurute:* see Introdn. § 21, note.

The total of the individual reigns (excluding no. 24*a*) is only $442^{1}/_{2}$ years, even if we take the longest periods wherever there is a difference; but the whole duration is said to have been 460 years in Mt, 411 in Vā, and 456 in Bḍ, Vṣ, and Bh. The addition of no. 24*a* would increase the first total.

Kāṇvāyanāṁs[1] tato bhṛtyāḥ[2]
Suśarmáṇaḥ[5] prasahya[6] tam[7]
Śuṅgānānṁ[9] caiva yac cheṣaṁ[10]
kṣapitvā tu[13] balīyasaḥ[14]
Śiśuko 'ndhraḥ[17] sa-jātīyaḥ[18]
prāpsyat=îmām vasundharām
trayo-viṁsat[20] samā rājā Simukars[21]

Kaṇvāyanaṁ[3] ath-ôddhṛtya[4]
Suśarmāṇam prasahya tam[8]
Śiṅgānāṁ[11] c-âpi yac chiṣṭaṁ[12]
kṣapayitvā[15] balaṁ tadā[16]
Sindhuko hy Andhra-jātīyaḥ[19]
prāpsyat=îmāṁ vasundharām
tu bhaviṣyati[22]

[1] This line is in Mt. This name is oftern corrupted as in p.34 note[11]; and first vowel is long or short. In *n*Mt °*yanāṁs*; *f*Mt° *yanī*; Mt genly °*yanās*, which should be °yanāṁs, as the accus. is required.

[2] So *dfgk* Mt; *b*Mt *tadā*° : *j*Mt tato bhaṛtyān. mt genly *tato bhūpāh* But *e*Mt *tadodhṛtya; cMt tad-oddhṛtya*; so *n*Mt crp. *Bhṛtyāh* is prob. correct, cf. Vṣ, Bh; the plural here may refer to 'Simuka and his fellow-tribesman' in 1.3 Vṣ says –

Suśarmāṇaṁ Kaṇvaṁ* ca bhṛtyo+ *balat*+ Śipraka§-nāmā hatvā‖ Andhra‖ jātīyo vasudhām bhoksyati:

where* *k*lVṣ kāṇraṁ, *b*Vṣ Kāṇrāyanaṁ; +*al* Vṣ *sa-bhṛtyaṁ, j*Vṣ *sra-bhṛtyo*, bVṣ *sadbhṛtya-*, kVṣ *sa bhūtyain*; + a Vṣ *balat, b Vṣ balaṁ, lVṣ sra-bhṛtyo, bVṣ sadbhṛtya, kVṣ sa bhūtyain; kVṣ Pulaka, lVṣ Pucchaka;* ll *bVṣ hatra-r;* ll *lVṣ Āndhra, bVṣ Aṁ[ptyaṁ] pra, kVṣ hy Andha, jVṣ Śudhra. Bh saya–*

hatvā Kāṇvaṁ* Suśarmāṇaṁ tad-hbṛtuo+ veṛṣalo balī

gām bhokṣyaty Andhra§-jātiyaḥ kañcit ll *kālam a- sattamaḥ:*

where *rBh *Karṇvaṁlm;* + *k*Bh *tadvatyo;* +*fl*Bh vṛṣabho° (*f strictly vṛṣabhordhatī*, cf. p.25, note[7]); §*d*Bh *Andhri, f* Bh *anaya;* ll *c Bh kiñcit.*

[3] This line in Vā, Bd. Bd Kaṇv°.Vāgenly Kaṇṭh°: other variations similar to those in p. 34 note[11]. Bd, ca[2]a[4]eVā *⁰yanam*; *a[1]a[3]bdfgklm Vā °yanān.*

[4] *So Ca[2] a[3]* eVā; Bd: a[1]a[4] k*l*Vā at-ōd° or at=ōdvṛtya; *fgm Vā ato dhṛtya; d Vā tat-ōdhṛtya (Pkt).*

[5] In *j*Mt °*ṇeḥ*; *ben*Mt °*ṇaṁl;* l*M*t °*ṇa;* *g*Mt °sarmāṇaṁ.

[6] In *a[2]n* Mt *pragṛya.*

[7] *Cbdj* Mt *tām; g*Mt; fMt *tvān.*

[8] In *e*Vā *Sudharmāinsain prasahyataḥ*

[9] So Mt; bMt; *Suṁnānāṁ*; *cekn* Mt *suta*⁰; *j*Mt *Aṁgārā.*

[10] In *e*Mt *caiva ḍheṣaṁ; f*Mt *caiva sarveṣāṁ.*

[11] This line is in Vā, not in Bḍ. Ca[1]a[2] Vā Śring°.

[12] In eVā *yac cheṣaḥ; fm* Vā defective.

[13] So Mt mostly; *d*Mt *kṣayitvā* sa; *ce*Mt kṛipitrā sa; *l*Mt jṛyitvā tu; fgn Mt kṣapayitvā, *j*Mt kṣep°, *b*Mt *kṛp°.*

[14] In *e*Mt *balāyasaḥ*; *j*Mt *mahīyasām.*

[15] CVā *kṣayayitvā.*

[16] In *e*Vā *balī tathā, d*Vā °tadā

[17] So Mt genly; *d*Mt °*dhrah; j*Mt °*ddhra; n*Mt °*dhra; k*Mt °*va; b*Mt °*yah; d*Mt Śiśurki° here, *Śiśukas* in next line; *e*Mt *Śiśruk-Āndhrah* ; *fg* Mt *Śikhukas tu; l*Mt *Kiṁśukrodhah.* The correct name is *Simuka* (Rapson, 'Indian Coina, Andhras, &c.'pp. xviii, xlvi). It was misread as *Sisuka*, and then Sktz (1) as *Śikśuka*, and (2) as Śiṣuka whence *Śikhuka*, by dialectcal variation of *ṣ* and *kh. Śikhuka*, could be misread as Śipraka which Vṣ has, see note.[2]

[18] In *k*Mt *śa-jāt*°.

[19] So Vā, Bḍ : *e*Vā *Chismako hy a-jātīyaḥ.*

[20] So C*dfgj* Mt, Vā, Bḍ. Mt genly °viṁśa: *e* Vā reads this line–

sa trayo-viṁśti rā[illegible]ā bhavitā Chismakaḥ samāḥ.

[21] I put the correct name here to combine Mt, Vā, Bḍ, which read it as above; *e*Mt *Śikśrukas* ; *c*Mt *Śiṁśukaḥ.*

[22] So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *bhavitā* tv atha; dVā omits *tv*; mVā °tv; a[*rka*] thain; gVā bhavitā [s] tathā.

Kṛṣṇo[23] bhrātā yavīyāṁs tu[24]
aṣṭādaśa[27] bhaviṣyati
Kṛṣṇo[25] bhrāt-âsya[26] varṣāṇi
so smād daśa[28] bhaviṣyati
Śirī-Śātakarṇir[29] bhavitā tasya putras[30] tu vai daśa[31]
Pūraṇotsaṅgas[32] tato[33] rājā varṣāṇy[34] aṣṭādaśaiva tu
Skandhastambhis[35] tathā[36] rājā varṣāny[37] aṣṭādaśaiva tu
pañcāśaṁ[38] samāḥ ṣaṭ ca[39] Sātakarṇir[40] bhaviṣyati
daśa cāṣṭu ca[41] varṣṭau ca[41] varṣāni tasya[42] Lambodaraḥ[43] sutaḥ[44]
Āpīlaki[45] daśa dve ca[46] tasya putro bhaviṣyati

[23] Mt genly the Pkt nomin. form *Kṛṣṇa-nāmā* tadbhrātā. Bh says–
Kṛṣṇa-nāmatha tad-bhrātā bhavitā pṛthivī-patiḥ.
See Rapson, *op. cit.*, pp. xix, xlxi.

[24] In *fg* Mt ea.

[25] So $a^{1}a^{3}a^{4}dg$ Vā, Bḍ; eVā *Kṛṣṇā;* bVā klptau; a^{2} Vā *Tvaṣto; fm Vā Tvaṣtro; CjkI*Vāaṣṭau.

[26] So bde Vā, Bd $a^{1\text{-}4}$ *fgkm* Vā, 3 MISS of CVā *bhrātasya*; *I*Vā,2 MSS of CVa⁻bhrātaśea; 1 Ms of CVā *smātasya.*

[27] So all Mt; but *n*Mt *aṣṭāṁ* daśa, see Introdn.ą̄ 40.

[28] So $a^{2\text{-}4}$ *bdfgkm* Vā, Bḍ: *I*Va *so smā* dº; eVā *so' ṣṭād*º; Ca^{1}jVā tasmād dº : see Introdn. ą̄ 40.

[29] This name is spelt variously, see p. 37. Vā genly º*Śātkarṇir*. Bḍ, Vṣ º*Sāntakarṇir*. But bcde Mt ºMalakarnī, *n*Mt º*kaṇi* (easy misreadings); Mt genly º*Mallakarṇi*; *j*Mt º*Śālakarṇir*, *k*Mt o*parṇi*. Bh *Śāntakarṇa*, *f*Bh º*varna.*

[30] Bh, *I*Vṣ agree, *tasya* putras : *fgi* Mt *putrās.*

[31] So Mt genly; *beekn samāḥ. fgi* Mt putrās.

[32] This line is only in Mt, eVā. So Mt genly; *f*Mt Pūrṇotsarga; *c*Mt Pūrṇāsaṅgas, eMt º*sagas* : *e*Vā reads this line–
Pūrṇosantu ca varṣāṇi bhavit aṣṭādaśaiva tu.
Vṣ *Pūrṇotaṅga*; *j*Vṣ º saṁ[mṛ]ga' *h*Vṣ *Pūrṇeśaṅga; lVṣ Vasukarṇṇotsṅga.* Bh *Paurṇamās,* and adds *tat-sutaḥ.*

[33] Tu *vai* in *been* Mt.

[34] *Samā* in *n*Mt.

[35] This line is only bdfgn Mt. So *fg* Mt; *d*Mt º*stabhis*; (an easy misreading); *n*Mt *Śovastuti,* and inverts him and the next king.

[36] *Tapā* in *n*Mt.

[37] Samā in *u*Mt.

[38] So Vā, *Cedemn* Mt; *j*Mt º*śatāḥ*. Bḍ, *bfg* Mt º*śat tu; Akl* Mt º*śac* ca.

[39] *Saṭkar* in eVā; *e*Mt *ṣaḍu; n*Mt omits ca.

[40] No marked variations the preceding king; *n*Mt inverts him and the preceding king; *m*Vā repeating the line reads *tasya tasya putro.* Bh omits him.

[41] Daśa vāsaiva in *b*Mt.

[42] In *e*Vā[*bhavita*] tasmāl.

[43] This line only in Mt and eVā. Bh and Vṣ agree in the name.

[44] Bh agrees, *tat-putras* : eVā *nṛpaḥ.*

[45] Mt genly *Āpītakv; cfg* Mt *Apīt*º; *e*Mt *Apiṭ*º; *n*Mt Apīt º; *e*Mt *Apiṭ*º; *n*Mt Apīt º or Apīl º; *b*Mt + *Aryāṁtako*: *e*Vā *Āpīlako*. But gVā *Āpīlavā*; *f*Vā, 3 MSS of CVā *Āpol*º or *Arpāl*º $a^{1\text{-}4}$ Vā, 2 MSS of *C*Vā *Āpādaba-*; *bd* Vā *Āpīstarā*. Bḍ *Āpolavo. Āpīlaka* seems the best form: the third syll. *ta* in Mt names may be a misreading of *la*, and it was apptly often read as Pkt *tasmā* with the final d applied to the name; thus *I*Vṣ *Dāpilaka* (though it interposes ca), and *cdek* Vṣ (*tasmādivīlakaḥ*) *Ivīl*º or Divīl º; jVṣ *Vilaka*; bVṣ *Divānīka*. Bh genly (reading *d* in Gupta script as c) *Civilaka* or *Cibil*º. Bh *Cilbaka*, *d*Bh º*bika; c*Bh *Cibilika, Vicilaka*; aqs *r*Bh *Vivilaka*, *h*Bh Yil º or *Ghil*º and *Civil*º. BBh *Vikala* apptly.

[46] So Mt; *cen*Mt *tu*. Vā genly, Bd *dvādaśa vai,* which is equally good: $a^{1\text{-}4}$ Vā, 2 MSS of CVā + *-ddhodaśa*º.

daśa cāṣṭau ca varṣāṇi Meghasvātir[47] bhaviṣyati
Svātiś ca bhavitā[48] rājā[49] Ātir bhaviṣyati nṛpo
samās[50] tv aṣṭādaś-aiva[51] tu varṣāṇi dvādaśaiva tu[52]
Skandasvātis[53] tathā rājā Skandasvātiḥ samās tasmāt
sapt-aiva tu[54] bhaviṣyati sapta[55] rājyaṁ kariṣyati
Mṛgendraḥ[56] Svātikarṇas[57] tu[58] bhaviṣyati samās trayaḥ[59]
Kuntalaḥ[60] Savātikarṇas[61] tu[62] bhavitaṣṭau samā[63] nṛpah
eka-saṁvatsaraṁ[64] rājā Svātivarṇo[65] bhaviṣyati
ṣaṭ-triṁśad[66] eva[67] varṣāni catur-viṁśat[68] tu varṣāni
Pulomāvir[69] bhaviṣyati Pulomāvir[69] bhaviṣyati

bhavit-Ârisṭakarṇas[70] tu varṣāṇām pañca-viṁśatiḥ[71]

47 This line only in Mt, *e*Vā. So Mt genly; *j*Mt *Saṁghasvāpi,* an easy misreading; *ce*Mt *Saṁghaścâpi.* Vṣ, *Bh Meghasvāti, j*Vṣ *Maghas°*; *k*Vṣ *Meghaghāti.* The name has been corrupted in eVā whihc reads–
daśa câṣṭan ca bhavitā so ' ṣṭādaśa bhaviṣyati.

48 This line only in Mt : B*l*Mt *Svātir bhaviṣyate, n*Mt *Svāmī* bh°; *g*Mt, in repeating the line, *Svāmī bh°*; gMt, in repeating the line *Svāmi bh°* : ceMt sa eva bhokṣyate.

49 In *b*Mt *ramyā*

50 In *celn* Mt *samā : b*Mt *manās,* so *g*Mt in repeating.

51 In *cen* Mt aṣṭau daśaiva (omitting *tu*).

52 This line is in eVā only. Introdn. ą̄ 40.

53 So Mt, mostly. CMt and *g*Mt (in repeating) *Skandhasvātis, d*Mt o*svāmis*; *l*Mt *Skaṁvastrānis* 'an easy misreading).

54 Misread as *samaiva tva* in *g*Mt (repeated), °*tvaṁ in b*Mt; *cen* Mt *sapta caiva.*

55 This line in *e*Vā only; thus, *Skandansvātiḥ* samāt *tasmā*, where samā is misreading for *sapta.*

56 This line only in Mt, *e*Vā; *b*Mt *Bhagendraḥ*; eVā *Mahen°*; *j*Mt naren°.

57 So Mt genly : *fg*Mt °*varṇas*, but gMt repeasts as in text; *n*Mt Śātikarṇas; eVā *Sātkarṇis.*

58 In eMt mu: after this nMt adds by mistake and superfluously *varṣāṇi* Ipañcaviṁśati (from 1.19).

59 In eVā *samā-trayam.*

60 This line only in Mt, *e*Vā : *b*Mt *Kuśalaḥ*; *j*Mt *Ksettulaḥ*

61 In *n*Mt Śāntik°; *e*Vā *Śātakarṇis.*

62 Ca in *cef* Mt, and gMt in repeating.

63 In *j*Mt °*âṣṭā samo.*

64 But *bejln* Mt °*samvatsaro e*Mt °śe v°, *g*Mt (in repeating) śakasaṁv°.

65 This line only in Mt, *e*Vā. So *ACbdl* Mt: *cej* Mt °*karṇo*; *fgm*Mt °*koṇo, g*Mt (in repeating) °*varṇo*; *d*Mt °*keṇo; e*Vā °*ṣeno*; *k*Mt *Syātiseno*; *n*Mt Śātikarṇo.

66 This line is in Mt, except *AC* Mt: *l*m Mt *ṣaḍ triṁśad; g*Mt (in repeating): *l*Mt *deva*; *jk*Mt *caiva*; *cen*Mt *tv eva*; *bfg* Mt *dveca.*

67 So *dm*Mt and *g*MT (In repeating) °*vi* : *ce*Mt *Pulomāvid* ; *j*Mt *Sulomānir* (an easy misreading). In Vā: *dg*Vā, *Yadu°*; and so a^2a^4 *l*Vā and 3 MSS of CVā): then by easy misreadings, *b*Vā *Patramātir* (or Ya°)' fVā *Ṣaṭumāvir*; 4 MSS of CVā *Ṣaḍu°*; mVā *Ṣaṭu° or Ṣadu°*; *j*Vā *Ṣadrarmāvi*; a^1 Vā and 2 MSS of CVā *ṣaṭ samā vai* (by attempt at emendment). By regarding the final *vi* (in Pkt) as an expletive (=*vai or api*), *hj*Vṣ *Pudumān or Paṭu°*; abedegk*l* Vṣ Patu°; Bḍ *Paṭumāṁś ca*; other Vṣ *Paḍhumān.* Then or Bh Vaṭamāna; Bh genly Aṭa°; sBh Raca°. For this name *fm* Mt substitute (a second) *Meghasvātir*; and *g*Mt *Bhegha°*.

70 There is great variation in this name Vā genly *bhavita Nemikṛṣṇas*; *d*Vāo *Nemikasmas; m*Mt °*Nauvikṛṣnas; d*Mt °Naurik°; jMt° Nārik°; kMt °*Saurik°; fg* Mt° *ṣṭauvik°*; *e*Mt °Gaurak°; *c*Mt °*Gaurakṛtsvas. AC* Mt *bhavit Ârisṭakrṇis.* Vṣ *Ariṣtakarmā*; so a Bh. Bḍ *bhavit* Ânisṭakarṇis. Vṣ Ariṣṭalarmā; so a Bh. Bḍ *bhavit Ânisṭakarmā.* Bh *Aniṣtakarmā.* It is impossible to extract the correct name out of the this confusion, and I have adopted *Ariṣṭakarṇa* as the most central form.

tataḥ saṁvatsarān[72] Hālo[73] rājā bhaviṣyati
pañca Mantalako[74] rājā[75]
bhaviṣyati samā nṛpaḥ[77]
Purīndraseno[79] bhavitā
tasmāt samnyo bhaviṣyati[81]
Sundaraḥ[83] Śātkarṇis[84] tu
abdam[86] ekam bhaviṣyati

pañca Pattalako[74] rājā[76]
bhaviṣyati mahābalaḥ[78]
bhāvyaḥ Purikaṣeṇas[80] tu
samāḥ so py eka-viṁśatim[82]
Śātakarṇir[85] varṣam ekam
bhaviṣyati narādipaḥ
Cakoraḥ[87] Śātkarṇis[88] tu ṣaṇ māsān[89] vai bhaviṣyati[90]

[71] So a^1 a^2 a^4 bdfg Vā: Vā genly, *b*Mt, Bḍ °*tim. Mt varṣāṇi...lih; j*Mt reads this half line, *ṣaṇ-māsān vai bhaviṣyati.*

[72] So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *sanivatsaram pūrṇam.*

[73] So all, except *I*Vṣ *Hala*; Bh *Hāleya*; *r*Bh *Hālela* or *Hālena*; cBh *Hālaya.*

[74] There is great variation in this name. ACb Mt *Mandulako*; *fgkn* Mt *Maṇḍalako*; *d*Mt *Maṇḍako*; *m*Mt *Kuṇḍalako, e*Mt, °*laṁk*; *l*Mt *Menulake; fgkn* Mt *Maṇḍalako*; dMt *Maṇḍako*; *m*Mt *Kuṇḍalako.* Then *k*Vṣ *Pantalaka or Patt°;* Vṣ *Pakṣal°*; a Vṣ *Prabhul°* (or prattal°?). Bḍ *Pattallaka.* Bh, losing the first syll., *Talaka*; *h*Bh *Halaka*; *d*Bh Śūl°. Vā, by losing the third syllable, *Saptaka*; *f*Vā *Sapataṁka*; *bd*Vā *Masaka* (*misreading of Maptaka?*): eVā reads this *laka* or *Pattalaka* seems the most likely form, from which the other readings might have been derived by misreadings. Bh says, *tasya cdtmajah.*

[75] So Mt, eVā: bMt *rākṣo.*

[76] Vā, to compensate for the lost syllable in *Saptaka*, and by the meaning of *Sapta*, reads *rājāno* and turns the two following words into plurals: *m*Vā rānā[maṁ] no, Bḍnāma. The correct reading must be rājā.

[77] So Mt, eVā, where *uṛpaḥ* ia redundant, ef. line 26.

[78] So Bd. Vā °*ṣyanti mahābalāh.*

[79] This line is in Mt. So Mt genly; CMt °*seno* or °senī; *n*Mt *Purindraseno* and Purīdra°; bMt *Puraṇḍa*: *h*Vṣ *Pulindrāsana* (for °drasena); where pra may be a misreading of *pu.*

[80] This line is in Vā, Bḍ. So $a^{1\text{-}4}$ *fglm*Vā; bdVā *Purīkeṇus*; CVā *Putrikaṣeṇas.* Then *d*Bh *Purīṣaseru* (where s and bh are much alike); ars Bh°*bheru*; *eghjklmupq* Bh °*bhoru;* other Bh, Bḍ *obhīru.* These variations suggest the name *Puruṣasena.* A king *Purisadata* of the Ikhākus is mentioned, see p.37.

[81] So Mt. genly: *b*Mt sāmyo°; *n*Mt *saimyo°*, °*yau°*; dMt *seno°. Saumyo* cannot well be a king, though the line says so on its face, because in this dynasty two kings are never put together in a single line without any mention of their reigns. Saumyo *bhaviṣyati* is probably a corruption, see Appendix II, ā̃ iii.

[82] So *Ca²fjkm* Vā, Bḍ: $a^1a^3a^4$ *bdhlVā tih; g*Vā °ti: eVā reads this half line samā dvādaśa *bhū-tale.*

[83] This line is in Mt, *e*Vā. Vṣ *Sundara*: *fg* Mt *Sundharaḥ.* Bh, *I*Vṣ *Sunandana.*

[84] Usual variations, see p.37.

[85] So Vā, Bḍ, with variations, but no personal name: I MS of CVā *Śantakīrttir.*

[86] In *e*Vā *varṣam*; *j*Mt...*tam.*

[87] So Mt genly, eVā, Vā genly Cakāra. Vṣ, Bh *Cakora*; *gp*Bh *Cakara*; *h*Vṣ Cā [*kā*]*kāra.* But *ce*Mt *Rājāda*; *n*Mt rājā *vai*: *b*Mt reads this half line rājā vaṁśyo vikarṇaś ca: *I*Vṣ merely *Sātalarṇi.*

[88] So Vā, *cdefgjn* Mt, Vṣ, with variations. Mt genly *Svātikarnas.* Instead of this name Bh genly vaṭako *yatra*; *r*Bh *vaṭṭka*$^{-0}$; *n*Bh (and *B*Bh?) *navamo°*; *j*Bh *cavako°* altered to vaṭako° *Gg*Bh *bahavo°*; *d*Bh *baṭako* (or ṣaṭako) *yasya.* Read vaṭuko *yasya?*

[89] In *bde*Mt *māso*; e Vā ṣaṭ samān.

[90] So Mt. Vā genly *vai narādhipah*; *e*Vā *bhavita nṛpaḥ*; k Vā *vi*[ta] *narādhipah.*

aṣṭā-viṁśati[91] varṣāni Śivasvātir[92] bhaviṣyati
rājā ca Gautamīputra[93] eka-viṁśat tato[94] nṛpaḥ[95]
aṣṭā-vimśaḥ[96] sutas[97] tasya Pulomā vai[98] bhaviṣyati
[ek-ôna-triṁśatim bhāvyaḥ Śatakarṇis tatho nṛpaḥ][99]
Sivaśir[1] vai Pulomā tu[2] saptaiva[3] bhavitā nṛpah[4]
Śivaskandhaḥ[5] Śatakarṇir[6] bhavit-âsy-âtmajaḥ samāh[7]
nava-viṁśati[8] varṣāṇi ek-ôna-viṁśatiṁ[9] rājā
Yajñaśriḥ[10] Śātakarṇikaḥ[11] Yajñaśrīḥ[12] Śatakarṇy atha[13]

[91] So Mt, *bm* Vā. Bḍ, Vā genly, *j*Mt °*viṁśat tu.*

[92] So Mt, *d*Vā Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree: *I*Vṣ *svātih*; a *Siras*°, *Svātih; fg* Mt *Śikhasvātir*;, Bh *Siras*°; *j*Mt Śiraḥs°. *Ca*[1]*djlVā Śivasvāmī;* a[3-4] *bfghk* Vā °svāmir; m Vā °svāmīr. Bh calls him *arindamah.*

[93] In be Mt, bVṣ Gotamīp°. Vṣ, Bh *Gomatīp*°; *I*Vṣ *Gomati.* Mt adds *hy.*

[94] So *dfgi Mt,* a[3] Vā; *cn*Mt °viṁśa°. AmMt *eka-vimiśaty at;* CMt *aka-v*° by misprint : *b*Mt, a[1]a[3]a[4] *bdfghklm* Vā *eka-viṁśattamo*; C*j* Vā, Bḍ °*viṁśat samā. Eka-viṁśattamo*, '21st king', can hardly be right, because he is not 21st in any list except A Mt where two preceding kings are omitted: and he can only be made 21st omissions.

[95] So Mt, *bdfghlm Vā* Bḍ, though it is redundant. *AjkVā nṛsu.*

[96] This line only in Mt : *dg* Mt °sa; *bj* Mt °śat; CMT °śati.

[97] In *n*Mt *tutas*; *j*Mt *tatas*; *b*Mt *samas.*

[98] *Cb*Mt *Sulomā vai;* but beMt *Pulomā tu* in next line. Vṣ *Pulimān; lVṣ* Pul°; aVṣ *Kul*° Bh *Pulimān*: kBh *Purī*°; *f*Bh Putrī°. The name should no doubt be *Pulomāvir.* Vṣ adds, *tat-putraḥ.*

[99] This line only in eVā: see p.37.

[1] This line only in Mt, eVā. So Mt genly: ceMt °*śrī*; *n*Mt °*śvā*; *b*Mt *Sivasīr*; *j*Mt *Śirogrīvaḥ* (omitting *vai*). Vṣ *Śātakarṇā Śivaśrīh; I*Vṣ makes this two kings, *tasydpi Śatalarṇiḥ* tataś *Śivaśrīḥ* (see p.37): *d*Bh Sacaśirā; *n*Bh Midaśirāḥ; Bh genly Medaś°; *k*Bh *Medāś*°; fBh *Medaśś*°. This half line in eVā is Śirasī putra A ¯*vis* tu.

[2] So Mt genly; cMt° *māḥtu;* bg Mt° *māsu.* But *j*Mt °*māt* tu; CMt *Sulomāt tu.*

[3] In *b*Mt *samaiva*; eVā *catasro.*

[4] In *e*Vā *samāḥ.*

[5] This line only in Mt, Vā. So Mt genly. Vṣ, *afmnr* Bh agree : cBh °*skadhre* : *dfg* Mt, Bh genly, h*I*Vṣ °*skandaḥ* (altered in sBh to °*skandha*); bVṣ °*svanda*; *k*Vṣ °*sunda* : *j*Mt Śiraskandho, *e*Vā °*skandah.*

[6] So *cdefgmn* Mt, eVā; *b*Mt Sāmak° AC*I*Mt Śātikarṇād; *k*Mt Śalaiḥkarṇikā; JMt *Nṛpaskando.*

[7] So *cdejn* Mt; *b*Mt defective vinâsy°; *fg*Mt *bhāvī tasy*° *ACklm Mt bhavitā hy āt*°*: eVā bhaviṣyati samā nṛpaḥ.* No number is mentioned. Perhpas Mt should read, *bhāvītasmāt trayo samāh* (see Appendix I, ā̤ iii), and eVā *bhaviṣyati samās* itrayaḥ.

[8] So Mt: *j*Mt °*viṁśat tu; fg* Mt °śivát tu*: beeln* Mt read this line–

nava varṣāṇi Yajñaśriḥ* kurute+ Śātakarnikah+.

where* *b*Mt °ṣṇīḥ; +bMt kurune, *n*Mt *kusate;* +ceMt °*Karṇinā*, *l*Mt *Sātavarṇitā, b*Mt *Śaḥsakarnikaḥ.*

[9] So Vā, Bḍ: bdgh Vā °*triṁśatam*; kVā *trikonatriśatam.*

[10] Mat genly Yajñaśrīḥ; *dl*Mt °śrī; *j*Mt *Yajñaḥ Śri–*

[11] In *k*Mt Śattakarṇinā.

[12] So Ca[3]ejVā; mVā *Yajñaḥ* Śrīḥ. Bḍ *Yajñaḥ Śri-*: a[1]a[2]a[4] bfg*I*Vā Yajuḥśrī-h' dhk Vā Yajuśrī-ḥ. Vṣ, Bh Yajñaśrīḥ withmarg. alternation °sāra in aBh; sBh °sīla, altered to °śrī: kVṣ Suṅgaśrīs. Bh adds *tat-sutas.*

[13] In eVā °api : 2MSS of CVā *Sāmakarṇy atha.*

ṣaḍ eva[14] bhavita[15] tasmād[16] Vijayas[17] tu samā nṛpaḥ[18]
Caṇḍaśrīh[19] Śātakarṇis[20] tu[21] Daṇḍaśrih[22] Śātakarṇī ca
tasya putraḥ[19] samā daśa tasya putraḥ samās trayaḥ[23]
Pulomāviḥ[24] samāḥ sapta[25] anayas teṣām[26] bhaviṣyati
ek-ôna-viṁśatir hy ete[27] ity ete vai nṛpās triṁśad[28]
Āndhra[29] bhokṣyanti vai mahīm Andhrā[30] bhokṣyanti ye[31] mahim
teṣāṁ varṣa-śatāni sauś samāh śatāni catvāri
catvāri ṣaṣṭir[32] eva ca. pañca ṣaḍ vai tathaiva ca[33].

[14] In eVā *etc.*

[15] In *j*Mt naciḍā (misreading of *bhavitā* in old Bengali script?).

[16] In *been* Mt *yasmād; e*Vā *vastu.*

[17] So all: but *de* Vṣ Vījaya; *b*Mt, *j*Vṣ *Vijas*; eVā dvijaḥ yaśu (omitting tu); bVṣ *Deviyajña*; *l*Bh Vinaya. Bh says, tat-suto.

[18] So Vā, Bḍ. Mt genly *samās tataḥ. bon* Mt samaṁ°; fgj Mt [*sa*] *samā daśa.*

[19] So Mt genly; cMt *Caḍaśrīḥ*; eg Mt *Vaṇḍa*°; *b*Mt *Candratīh.* Vṣ genly *Candraśrīh*; cVṣ Cadra° : *d*Bh *Candraṣīja*, fr Bh °*vīja*, as Bh °*vīrya*, Bh genly °*vijñaḥ.*

[20] Mt genly *Śāntikarṇas*, with variations; bg Mt *Śamakarṇis.*

[21] So Mt, *e*Vā. Vā, Bḍ *ca.*

[22] So Vā. Bḍ Daṇḍa-Śri-,

[23] In *e*Vā *samâs trayam; a*[1] Vā *samāśrayah.*

[24] So *e*Vā, aVṣ; *l*Vṣ °māvī. Bḍ °*mārih.* Vṣ genly °māciḥ; *cdefik* Vṣ °mārcḥi; *h*Vṣ °*mādi;* bVṣ *Anulomāvih.* Bh genly *Salomadhih*; *m*Bh Sul°; *k*Bh *Mal*° (all easy misreadings).

[25] Mt genly *Pulomā sapta varṣāṇti; Cbdm* Mt Sul°; where the last syll. of the names has been probably regarded as a particle and ousted by the change of Pkt *varṣā* to Skt *varṣāṇi.* Vā genly *Pulovdpi.*

[26] So Mt, Vā genly : *e*Mt *antyes*°, *n*Mt *antas*°, *c*Mt aṁnyas° ; all mistakes for *anlyas teṣām,* probably the true reading of. p. 12, l. 22; p. 18, note[7]. Ca[2]fVā +*anyeṣāṁ ca* (*f* omits ca). Bḍ *tataś caiṣām; e*Vā *san tasmād.*

[27] So Mt, genly : *fg*Mt °śati°; *d*Mt °śatiś c ête; ce Mt +*ekānā-n*°.

[28] So Vā, Bḍ : mVā omits this line.

[29] So Mt genly : *cfjn* Mt *Andhrā ; d*Mt *Andhrān ; b* Mt nṛpā.

[30] In *e*Vā. *akṣā.*

[31] So Vā. Bḍ, gVā uv*l.*

[32] So Mt : *n*Mt ṣaṣtīr, *b*Mt *ṣaṣṭiṁ* : *j*Mt reads this line–dvādaś-âdhikam eteṣāṁ rājyaṁ śatacatuṣayam.

[33] This line is in Vā, Bḍ : not in *m*Vā. So Vā genly: *h*Vā pañca ṣaḍ va° : *bdfgk* Vā °*ṣaṭ ca*°; *eVā* °*ṣaṭ sapta caiva hi.* Bḍ *Pañcāśat* ṣaṭ *tath* aiva ca. Vṣ says–

evam etc triṁśat* catvāry abda+-śatānisaṭ-puñcāśad+-adhikāni pṛthivīam bhokṣyanti: where* *k*Vṣ omits *triṁśat; +h*Vṣ *aṣta; ++ l*Vṣ ṣaś pañcā [da] śad. Bh says– ete triṁśan* nṛpatayaś catvārv aboda+- śatāni ca

śaṭ pañcāśac ca pṛthivīm bhokṣyanti, Kurunandana:

where* aBh has *vimśan* written above; *g*Bh *aṣta.*

Various Local Dynasties.

Text–AMt *273*, 17^{b}-24; AVā *99*, 358^{b}–365; Bḍ iii, *74*, *171-179*^{a}.

Corresp. passages–CVṣ iv, *24*, 13-16; GBh xii, *1*, *29-32*^{b}.

The account of these dynasties consists of three parts, the first of which summarizes the number of kings in each dynasty and the second states its duration, while the third adds certain subsequent kings. In the first part the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa agree generally, but in the second the Matsya has one version and the two others another. Here the dynastic matter in the Matsya ends, and the third part is found only in the two others. The Bhāgavata gives the first part in verses which are much like the texts of those Purāṇas, only the concluding portion of the second, and a very brief notice of the third. In the first part therefore the two versions are printed side by side. In the second part the Matsya version and that of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa are compared side by side, but in the third there is only the text common to those two. The Bhāgavata statements in both these parts are given in the notes. The Viṣṇu in prose agrees closely with the Bhāgavata.

The Vā and Bḍ mention the dynasties in the second part in the same order that all three Purāṇas observe in the first part, but the Mt verses are disarranged in the second part, and are re-arranged here in that order for convenience. This involves no tampering with its text, because each line is complete in itself and independent, except II. 12, 13 which compose a couplet forming verse 22 and which remain undisturbed; hence the Mt verses are placed here thus, 23^{b},24^{a}, 20^{b}, 21^{b}, 20^{a}, 21^{a}, 22^{ab}, 23^{a}, 24^{b}.

The Mt is generally complete; but *e*Mt 1.8; *g*Mt repeats 11.3; 4 after 1.10; *k*Mt omits 11. 12-14; *f*Mt repeats 11. 3, 4 after 1. 10; *k*Mt omits 11.4, 5; *hp*Mt have nothing. *AC*Vā omit 11.7, 8, but *A*Vā mentions them in a note; most other copies give them; *a*^{4} Vā omits 11.7 (second half)-9 (first half); *m*Vā 11. 1-3, but they are added in the margin. Of Bh versions *j* omits 11.1-5, but they are added in the margin; *bt* have nothing.

These local dynasties are all classed together as more or less contemporaneous. The number of years assigned to them must be considered according to the remarks in Introdn. §§42 ff., and with reference to the middle of the 3rd century A.D. when the account was first compiled as preserved in the Mt, for the revised versions in Vā and Bḍ did not revise the periods[1]. If those remarks be sound, the Śrīparvatīya Andhrabhṛtyas had at that time reigned 52 years, or (if we reach *dviḥ pañcāśatam*) possibly 100 roundly, arrording to Mt; while the Vā and Bḍ reading is no doubt corrupt and should perhaps be 112 or 102 years. The Ābhīras had then reigned 67 years, the Gardabhilas 72 years, the Śakas 183 years, the Yavanas 87 or 82 years, and the Tuṣāras 7,000 or 500 according to the proper construction of the sentences but perhaps 107 or 105 is really meant. The 13 Guruṇḍas or Muruṇḍas had then reigned half of the quadruple of 100 years, that is 200, according to Mt, or 350 according to Vā and Bḍ, but the latter is probably a corruption of the former reading, for Vṣ and Bh say precisely 199 years. The 11 Hūṇas or Maunas had them lasted 103 years.

Mention of these races in found in the inscriptions; thus Ābhīras in Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, nos. 963, 1137 (Epig. Ind. x, Appendix) and Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, p.14; Śakas, Lüders' list, nos. 1123, 1135, 1137, 1148, 1149, 1162, and perhaps 1001-2 and FGI p. 14; Yavanas, Lüder's listm nos, 669, 695, 1093, 1123, 1140, 1154, 1156; Murṇḍas in FGI, p. 14, and Muruṇḍadevī, *id.*, pp. 128, 132, 138; Hūṇas, FGI, pp.56, 148, 206. A Vākāṭaka prince Vindhvaśakti is mentioned in Kielhorn's Inscriptions of Northern India, no. 622 (Epig. Ind. v, Appendix).

1. Except in 1. 6, if Mt reading *dvi-pañcāśatam* is right, and if we emend Vā and Bḍ to *daśa dve ca sataṁ ca vai*; see Introdn. § 41.

Mt, Vā, Bḍ.	*Bh* (with *Vṣ*).
Andhrāṇāṁ[1] saṁsthite rājye[2]	
teṣām bhṛty-ânvayā[3] nṛpal[4]	Sapt-Âbhīrā Āndhrabhṛtyā[5]
sapt-Ândhrā[6] bhaviṣyanti	
daś-Âbhīrās[7] tathā nṛpāḥ[8]	

[1] So *edfn* Mt Vā, Bd. Mt genly Āndh°; *j*Mt sandh° : eVā Arthānāṁ.

[2] So *cdefgkn* Mt; jMt *sāthite*° *b*Mt saṁśrite°: other Mt Ssṁsthitā°: eVā saṁshitāḥ pañca; so m Vā (defective).

[3] So dfgk Mt, eVā; Mt *atrayā*; jMt +dady-dnrayā. Mt genly bhṛty-dnvaye: bMt-adyaso. But *fm Vā vaṁśāḥ svayāḥ (for vaṁs-ânvayāh?), Vāgenly °samāh. Bḍ vaṁśyās ca ye.*

[4] So Mt: fm Vā punāh, Vā. Bḍ punaḥ.

[5] *Bh genly Āvabhṛthyā; eBh Av°; aBh °c Âv°*; fBh *Avabhṛthyā; lVṣ Āndh°.*

[6] So Mt; eVā sapta cÂndhrā, Vā, Bḍ saptaiva tu; h Vā °nu.

[7] *So Mt, Vā genly, Bd: dVā° Âbhārās; eVā dār-Âbhīrās, dMt var-°jMt* varÂdhīrā; bMt nāv-Âmīrās; *l*Mt naiv Âbhirā: mMt, klVā defective; *fg*Mt Ābhirāś ca.

[8] So mt mostly: Vā, Bd tato°: *dn*Mt *nṛpās tathā, e Mt bhṛtās°. cMt mṛtās°. fg Mt vṛṣās°: j*Mt urpās *tadā.*

Notes and References

1. For these accounts, see *DKA*, pp. 35-43. This forms the basis of our following discussion. It is possible that a few other manuscripts left untapped by F.E. Pargiter, the compilor of the *DKA*, may contain some more vairants, but no attempt has been made to consult them and they are not likely to add much substantial to our knowledge. It does not, of course, mean that we agree with all the views of Pargiter about the Puāṇic tradition.

1a. After speaking of the Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana kings the Purāṇas aver that the earth (kingdom) will pass to the Andhras (*bhūmir=Andhrān gamishyati*), or will be owned by the Andhras (*bhūr-Andhrāṇāṁ bhavishyati*). *Vide DKA*, p. 35; R. Morton Smith, *Dates and Dynasties in the Earliest Purāṇas*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1973, pp. 53 (translation) and 374 (text). The correct form of the name is Andhra, not Āndhra with long initial *ā* which is the most popular now.

2. The correct original spelling of his name is known from his own coins where it is spelt as Chhimuka which was altered into Simuka in the reign of the next king, viz. his brother Kṛishṇa, who was, in our view responsible for putting up his statue with an inscription at Nāṇeghāṭ in the Puṇe district of Maharashtra. The statue is now lost, but the label fortunately remains. There was no real difference as *ch* or *chh* and *s* were interchangeable in the Deccan during the period in question.

3. *DKA*, p.38, line 5. *Śiśuko=ndhraḥ sa-jātīysḥ* and *Sindhuho hy-Andhrajātīyaḥ* are the two collated readings given by Pargiter. The former, which refers to the kings as Andhra and *sa-jāteya*, is evidently an error for *Andhra-jātīya* of the latter reading.

4. Nāsik inscription of Kaṇha, *HISWK*, p.2, line 1.

5. Nāsik inscription of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi's 19th year, *ibid.*, p. 45, line 6

6. The Aḍonī inscription of Puḷumāvi III, year 8, describes the king as belonging to the Sātavāhanas: *raño Sātavāhanani, ibid.*, p. 86, line 1.

7. Of course, barring variant spellings in the Purāṇas.

8. It was most probably becuase this region then formed part of the British region of the Madras Presidency Whereas the Telangānā region included in the state of Nizam's Hyderābād, though linguistically identical, was excluded from its purview.

9. *Early History of India*, pp. 217-19; *Oxford History of India*, p. 119.

10. *Cambridge History of India*, I, ed., E.J. Rapson, Cambridge, p. 519.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 542.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 543.

13. It was based on the reading *Dhanakaṭake-svāmi* in the Nāsik cave inscription of the eighteenth year of the time of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi which is now read, probably correctly, as *Benākaṭakasvāmi* and interpreted as 'lord of Benākaṭaka'. See *HISWK*, p. 26, line 1.

14. *EHD*, included in the *Collected Works of Sir R.G. Bhandarkar*, ed. N.B. utgikar, III, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune, 1926, pp. 28-29.
15. *Buddhist Stūpas of Amarāvatī and Jagayyāpeṭa*, London, 1887, pp.3-4.
16. ''Dekkan of the Sātavāhana Period'', *IA*, 1918, p.71; *Asoka*, 3rd ed., University of Calcutta, 1955, pp.31-32. He defines Andhradesa in the time of Ashoka and feels that it may have included the Telangānā region as well and the same definition continued up t the Sātavāhana period.
17. *EHDY*, pp.76-77.
18. ''Sātavāhanas and their Successors'', *Journal of the Madras University*, L (2), 1978, p. 3
19. ''Sātavāhanas and the Contemporary Kshtrapas'', *JBBRAS*, New Series, III (1928), pp. 51-52.
20. MSGH, I,pp. 68-69 and 71.
21. *HISWK*, pp. (9-12) and (44-45). Earlier he held that Vidarbha was the original home of the Sātavāhanas. He gave it up later in favour of Nāsik-Puṇe region.
22. *PHAI*, 6th edition University of Calcutta, 1953, pp. 412-13.
23. *EHAC*, pp. 15-16; *CHI*, II, pp. 291-97.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 298; *EHAC.*, P. 26. It is an erroneus impression created by R.G. Bhandarkar followed by several succeeding historians without varifying for themselves for themselves that the Puranas style the Sātavāhanas *Andhra-bhṛityas* or servants of the Andhras. Actually this designation is meaningfully employed with reference to some of the successors of the Sātavāhanas, the former being originally servants or vassals of Andhras or Sātavāhanas.
25. Findspots of coins, espically of silver and that too in hoards, cannot be taken to have been included within the kingdom of the issuer, for they could have reached there for various reasons and in different ways.
26. V.S. Bakhle (*op.cit.*, pp. 83-84) believes that Rudradāman I had driven the Sātavāhanas out of Maharashtra and Aparānta before 150 AD. He further supposes (*ibid.*, pp. 82-83) that the Purāṇas have ignored Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi because he was a western king (ie. ruling over Maharashtra and Aparānta) and mention Śivasrī as he ruled over Andhradeśa. As we have shown elsewhere, the Purāṇas are aware of Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi (*EHD:PP*, pp. 25-37). There is also clear evidence of Śivasrī's rule over areas of Maharashtra.
27. *DKA*, p.42, fn.8. Also see *ibid.*, introduction, p. xiii, fn.1.
28. *EHD: PP*, pp. 38-44.
29. This presumes the identity of Sātakaṛni, husband of queen Nāganikā mentioned in Vediśrī's Nāṇeghat inscription. Some scholars identify him with the second king of this name who was his grandson (G.V. Rao, *EHDY*, pp. 87-88; A.S. Altekar, *MSGH*, I, p. 63). However, in our opinion there was only one Sātakarṇi among the early members of the dynasty.
30. *HISWK*, p.11, line 2.
31. R.G. Bhandarkar has captioned Section IV of his *EHD* (p. 21) as 'Political History of the

Deccan or Maharashtra'. K. Gopalachari (*EHAC*, p. 20; *CHI*, II, p. 297) also takes it in the sense of Western Deccan or Maharashtra.

32. R.C. Majumdar (ed.), *CAI*, p. 304, paras 50-51. The Allāhābād pillar inscription of Samudra Gupta employs this name in the widest sense, and that also seems to be the intention of most of the ancient Indian writers who tried to make a clear distinction between the northern and southern parts of the Indian subcontinent.

33. V.S. Bakhle, *op.cit.*, pp. 83-84; H.C. Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, p. 496.

34. *HISWK*, p. 45, line 3.

35. Mark the name which refers to a *koṭa* (fort).

36. P.V. Parabrahama Sastry, ''Unknown Coins of the Sātavāhanas and their Predecessors'', *ND*, II (i) pp. 10-21; ''Some More Coins from Koṭaliṅgla", *ibid.*, III (ii), 17-28; P.L. Gupta, ''Koṭa-Lingāla Find of Post-Mauryan Coins'', *ibid.*, II (ii), pp. 24-33; D. Raja Reddy and P. Suryanarayana Reddy, ''Unpublished Sātavāhana Coins from Koṭaliṅgāla and Saṅgareḍḍy'', *NS*, pp. 45-52; ''Some More New Sātavāhana Coins'', *ibid.*, II, pp. 69-80.

37. Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Sātavāhana Prince Śaktikumāra : Numismatic Evidence'', *Kusumāñjali : New Interpretation of Indian Art and Culture (C. Sivaramamurti Commemoration Volume)*, ed. M.S. Nagaraja Rao, Agam Kala Prakashan, Delhi, 1987, pp. 447-53.

38. This is the spelling of the name found on some coins from Koṭalingāla.

39. These various spellings are encountered on coins and in inscriptions.

40. I owe this information to Dr. P.V. Parabrahma Sastry, formerly Dy. Director (Epigraph), Government of Andhra Pradesh.

41. This is the reading adopted by Pargiter. *Vide DKA*, p. 40, line 19.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 40, fn. 69.

43. This is Pargiter's accepted reading *(ibid.*, p. 42, lines 27 and 29).

44. *Ibid.*, p. 42, fns. 98 and 2.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 43, fn. 24.

46. This would show that the Telugu language was already fully developed in the first century AD when we first come across this name. K. Gopalachari, who is an opponent of the Andhra origin theory, also feels that this name `would seem to be of Dravidian origin', vide *CHI*, II, p. 315.

47. No silver coin of portrait type issued by Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi has yet been found, but such a possibility cannot be ruled out, especially when we find his immediate successor issuing such coins from the very beginning of his reign.

48. We find a portrait of this king at a young age on his silver issues.

49. *PHAI*, p. 412; *HCIP, II ; AIU* (D.C. Sircar), p. 194.

50. *SI*, I, p. 36, line 10 (Rock Edict XIII); p. 22, line 4 (Rock Edict V).

51. This spelling is met with in the Nāsik inscription of Kaṇha which is the earliest inscription of the dynasty.

52. The view of S.A. Jogalekar (*ABORI,* XXIII, pp. 169-205) that the 'Andhras were so called because they belonged to the Andhra valley in the Poona Dt.' has nothing to stand upon, for this region is nowhere mentioned in ancient literature or inscriptions by this name and the case in question just illustrates the common process of places or regions getting christened after the dynasties. Likewise, the theory of V.S. Sukthankar (''On the Original Home of the So-called Andhra Kings'', *ibid.,* I, pp. 21ff.) that the original home of the Sātavāhanas lay in the Bellāry district of Karnataka fares no better as this region also came to be known after the Sātavāhanas later owing to its long association with the Sātavāhanas, and not *vice versa.*

53. *EHD,* p. 34.

54. *ABORI,* I, pp. 21ff.

55. *EHAC,* pp. 21 and 25; *CHI,* II, p. 298.

56. *EHDY,* p. 75.

57 The Purāṇas aver with reference to the first Andhra king, whose name has been spelt variously in different manuscripts, that he was a servant (*bhṛitya*) of the last Kāṇvāyana king Suśarman and this indicates that to begin with he acknowledged the suzerainty of the latter, at least nominally. *Vide DKA,* p. 38, lines 1-2, left. The Andhras themselves are never styled Andhra-bhṛityas.

58. *Ibid.,* p. 45, left, lines 1-2 and right line 1. The *Matsya, Vāyu* and *Brahamāṇḍa* texts as collated by Pargiter aver that at the end of the Andhras (or even when they were in existence) the families of their vassals will assume power (*Andhrāṇāṁ saṁsthite rājye teshāṁ bhṛty-ānvayā nṛipāh),* whereas the *Bhāgavata* and *Vishṇu* speak of the Ābhīras, who are known to have succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the Western Deccan, as the Andhra-bhṛityas. It may be mentioned that it is only the last two texts that contain the specific appellation Andhra-bhṛitya.

59. E.J. Rapson, *BMC, AWK,* introduction, pp. xvi-xvii and xxvi (soon after Aśoka, i.e., 232 BC); *Cambridge History of India,* I, p.477 (before 200 BC); L.D. Barnett, *ibid.,* p. 543 (last quarter of the third century BC); V.A. Smith, *Early History of India,* 4th ed., Oxford, 1957, pp. 216-17 (240 or 230 BC); V.S. Bakhle *op.cit.,* p. 48 (*c.* 220 BC); K. Gopalachari, *EHAC., pp.* 28-29 and *CHI,* II, p. 295 (234 and *c.* 235 BC respectively); A.S. Altekar, *MSGH,* I, pp. 76-77 (*c.* 222 BC for Simuka who was preceded by king Sātavāhana); V.V. Mirashi, *HISWK,* p.3 (*c.* 230 BC), etc. Gurty Venkat Rao (*EHDY,* p. 90), however, dates this event much earlier and thinks that 'Simuka must have come to power about the year 271 BC'. I.K. Sarma (*Coinage of the Sātavāhana Empire,* Agam Prakashan, Delhi, 1980, p. 10) places Simuka in *c.* 230 BC.

60. H.C. Raychaudhuri, *PHAI,* pp. 403-6; D.C. Sircar, *HCIP,* II : *AIU,* p. 193 (30 BC); Ajay Mitra Shastri, *EHD:PP,* pp. 3ff. R.G. Bhandarkar, who also upheld the shorter duration, however, thought that the period of 112 years assigned by the Purāṇas to the Suṅgas really included the 45-year duration of the rule of the four Kāṇvāyana rulers also and accordingly dated the accession of the first Sātavāhana king Simuka in 73 BC. See *EHD,*

pp. 44 and 48. See also D.R. Bhandarkar, ''Dekkan of the Sātavāhana Period'', *IA*, 1918, p. 71, where the rise of the Andhras is placed about 75 BC. We shall be discussing this view at some length later.

61. Sudhakara Chattopadhyaya, ''The Purāṇic Account of the Sātavāhanas'', *JIH*, XLIV, pp. 359-65. This view, based as it is solely on the use of the word *punar* in a stanza of the *Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa (Kaṇvāyanās=tu chatvāraś=chatvāriṁśach=cha pañcha cha/Samā bhokshyanti pṛithiviṁ punar=Andhrān gamishyati//, DKA*, p. 35, fn. 42), has nothing to commend itself.

62. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

63. Thus the *Vāya* manuscripts name 17,18, 19 or 25; *Brahmāṇḍa* 17; *Bhāgavata 23;* and *Vishṇu* 22, 23 or 24. *Vide ibid.*, p. 36.

64. *Ek-ona-vṁiśatir=hy ete Andhrā bhokshyanti vai mahīm, ibid.*, p. 43, left column, lines 5-6. E.J. Rapson (*EMC, AWK*, introducion, p. lxiv and fn. 4), however, takes `19' as an error for `29'.

65. *DKA*, p. 36.

66. Thus the *Matsya* gives 460 years; *Vāyu* 411; *Brahmāṇḍa, Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata* 456. However, some *Matsya* manuscripts give 412 years. *Vide ibid.*, p. 43; text and fns. 32-33.

67. *Andhrā Bhokshyanti vasudhāṁ śate dve cha śataṁ cha vai.* This passage is quoted by R.G. Bhandarkar (*EHD*, p. 46 and fn. 1) but not found in Pargiter's collated version in *DKA* and underscores the necessity of further exploring the Purāṇa manuscripts from this point of view.

68. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

69. Gurty Venkat Rao, as we have seen above, however, dates this event in the first half of the third century BC (actually 271 BC).

70. His name is spelt in the Purāṇas variously as Śiśuka, Sindhuka, Śipraka, Śikhuka, Śiśurka, Śiśruka, Kiṁśuka and Chhismaka. The last spelling, which is much nearer the original form encountered in his own numismatic records, is met with only in a manuscript (termed eVā by Pargiter). See *DKA*, p. 38, fns. 17 and 19. These varying spellings have apparently resulted from defective manuscript tradition. The original and earliest form of the names is Chhimuka found on his coins and slightly later form is Simuka met with in a label inscription at Nāṇeghāṭ.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

72. Some take her to be the mother of Sātakarñi as she is referred to before the latter in a Nāñeghāṭ label inscription *(HISWK*, p. 20, for the inscription). See S.L. Katare, ''Two Unique Coins of the Sātavāhana Sātakarṇi I'' *JNSI*, XIII, pp. 38-39. But the find of a silver coin jointly issued by Sātakarṇi and Nāganikā (P.J. Chinmulgund, ''A Unique Silver Coin of Sātakarṇi and Nāganikā '', *ibid.*, XXXVIII, Part I, pp. 6-11) suffices to set this theory at naught. Two joint potin issues published recently also deserve notice in this connection. *Vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri and Sanjay Godbole, ''Two Potin Coins of Sātakarṇi and Nāganikā'', *ND*, XVIII, pp. 69-74.

73. *DKA*, p. 39.

74. *HISWK*, pp. 11ff.; 17ff.

75. *ASWI, V*, p. 31.

76. E.J. Rapson, *BMC, AWK*, Introduction, p. xix; *Cambridge History of India* I, pp. 477-78; V.V. Mirashi, *Studies in Indology*, III, Nagpur University, 1962, p. 2; *HISWK*, pp. 11ff.; 17ff., etc.

77. *EI*, XX, p. 79, line 4.

78. Both Sātakarṇi and Khāravela were the third members of their respective famīlies and both the dynasties appear to have come to power approximately at the same time. However, some scholars date the Hathigumphā inscription later than the Nāṇeghāt ones and propose to identify the Sātakarṇi mentioned in the former record with the second king of this name mentioned in some of the Purāṇas, viz. Sātakarñi II. *Vide* R.P. Chanda, *MASI*, I; *IA*, 1919, p. 214; *EHAC*, p. 37; *CHI*, II, p. 303; *MSGH*, I, p. 63, etc.

79. Bhagwanlal Indraji, Sten Konow and K.P. Jayaswal found an allusion to the 165th year of the Maurya era, but Jayaswal later abandoned this view. *Vide EI*, XX, p. 74. This reading was, however, followed by E.J. Rapson (*BMC, AWK*, Introduction, p. xvii) and Bühler (*Indian Palaeography*, Indian Reprint, Calcutta, 1959, p. 57).

80. *EI*, pp. 75 and 87. *Vide* also H. Lüders, "A List of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the earliest times to about A.D. 400, with the exception of those of Aśoka", Appendix to *EI*, X, No. 1345; Sten Konow, *Acta Orientalia*, I, p. 26.

81. H.C. Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*, pp. 405-6; D.C. Sircar, *SI*, p. 215, fn. 7, p. 220; B.M. Barua, *IHQ*, XIV, p. 469 and notes 136-37. For palaeographic dating of the Hathigumphā inscription, *SI*, p. 213, fn. 1.

81a. *ASWI*, V, p. 65.

82. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

83. *HISWK*, p. 2.

84. *ASWI*, V, p. 73.

85. V.V. Mirashi (*HISWK*, p. 5), for instance, observes that the characters of these records are not much later than those of Aśokan edicts.

85a. While the larger sacrificial record was put up by Nāganikā during the reign of her son Vediśrī about mid-first century AD, the label inscriptions were put up at various times after the demise of respective personages in what may be regarded as the *pratimā-gṛiha* (statue-gallery) of the Sātavāhanas, the oldest of these being that commemorating the death of the first Sātavāhana king here called Simuka Sātavāhana put up by his grateful brother Kṛishṇa who was responsible for designating the dynasty after him.

86. *ASWI*, V, p. 73.

87. The dates of the Vākāṭakas, Śarabhapurīyas, Pāṇḍuvaṁśins, Somavaṁśins and of the first Kalachuri king of Tripuri come under this category. For correct periods, see K.B.

Pathak, *IA*, L, 214-15; and V.V. Mirashi, *EI*, XII, p. 18 (Vākāṭakas); Ajay Mitra Shastri, *Inscriptions of the Śarabhapurīyas, Pāṇḍuvaṁśins and Somavaṁśins*, Part I, Indian Council of Historical Research, New Delhi, and Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1995, pp. 139ff. and 185ff. (Sarabhapuriyas, Pāṇḍuvaṁśins and Somavaṁśins); Mirashi, *Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era*, *CII*, IV, Government Epigraphist for India, Ootacamund, 1955, pp. 174-75 and Shastri, *Tripurī* (Hindi), Madhya Pradesh Hindi Grantha Academy, Bhopal, 1971, pp. 41-43 (Vāparājadeva).

88. H.D. Sankalia, S.B. Deo, Z.D. Ansari and Sophia Ehrrhardt, *From History to Pre-history at Nevasa* (*Nevasa* hereafter), Deccan College, Poona, 1960, p. 69. At p. 67, however, Period IV is stated to have lasted from *c.* 150 BC to 50 BC.

89. *Ibid.*, pp. 67-70; *Indian Archaeology-1959-60 - A Review*, p. 25.

90. *Nevasa*, pp. 67, 69-70. According to the later revised date, however, the beginning of Period V has to be placed around the beginning of the Christian era.

91. NBP sherds have been encountered in layers 3 and 4 of Trench Y assigned to Peiod IV. *Vide ibid.*, Fig. 84, p. 65.

92. We have a large number of such counterfeit punch-marked copper coins.

93. During the first two centuries AD forging of silver punch-marked coins by plating the copper core of the coins with silver was very rampant. See Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Presidential Address'', *Coinage, Trade and Economy*, ed. A.K. Jha, Indian Institute of Reserch in Numismatic Studies, Anjaneri, 1991, pp. XIIIff. For literary and epigraphic evidence on forgeries, see our ''Counterfeit Coins in Ancient India—Literary and Epigraphic Evidence'', *NS*, III, pp. 1-8.

94. *Nevasa*, p. 162. Also cf. p. 69 where the coins are stated to have been used as a principal evidence for dating the occupation of the weathered layer by the inhabitants of Period IV.

95. *Ibid.*, p. 162; ''New Coins of King Sātavāhana'', *JNSI*, XXII, p. 145.

96 These coins come from layer 8 of Trench E and layer 3 of Trenches I and X. *Vide Nevasa*, Fig. 84 and pp. 171-72.

97. *Ibid.*, Fig. 84, p. 65.

98. *Ibid.*, pp. 199-200.

99. We firmly hold that Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and his contemporary and adversary Nahapāna flourished in the first century AD, the former in the second half of this century. We are against referring the years of Nahapāna's records to the Śaka era of 78 AD and inclined to regard them as his regnal years.

100. *EHDPP*, pp. 131-37.

101. ''Two New Varieties of Vishṇukuṇḍin Coins from Vidarbha'', *JNSI*, XXVIII, pp. 164-69.

102. S.B. Deo and M.K. Dhavalikar, *Paunar Excavations*, Nagpur University, 1968, pp. 13-14. There is now a feeling in some quarters that these coins do not necessarily belong to the Vishṇukuṇḍins, but this agrument does in no way affect their dating potential.

103. P.L. Gupta (''Sātavāhana Coins from Excavations'', *Coinage of the Sātavāhanas and Coins from Excavations*, ed. Ajay Mitra Shastri, Nagpur University, 1972, pp. 132ff.) has also suggested on independent grounds the first century BC/AD for the beginning of Period IV. However, his date for the *terminus ad quem* of Period V viz. third-fourth century AD, does not admit of acceptance for the reasons discussed above as well as in the *EHDPP*, pp. 6-7.

104. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-24; ''Sātavāhana Prince Śakyikumāra: Numismatic Evidence'', *Kusumāñjali: New Interpretation of Indian Art and Culture (C. Sivaramanmurti Commemoration Volume)*, ed. M.S. Nagara Rao, Agam Kala Prakashan, Delhi, 1987, pp. 447-52.

105. *Ibid.*; *EHDPP*, pp. 16-24.

106. Ancient sites in South India including Kāñchīpuram, Kesanapalli, Śālihuṇḍam and others have yielded Rouletted ware which has been dated from about mid-first century BC. At the last-named site the excavator has attempted to place the ware in *c.* 2nd century BC basing on the palaeography of a few Brāhmī letters scratched on the sherds. However, it must be pointed out that the sherds were incised after firing and have in fact been found from the middle phase which the excavator himself has dated in the time-bracket from first-second to third-fourth century AD. It is pertinent to remember that the Early phase at the site placed between second-third century BC and first-second century AD has not thrown up any evidence of this ware which, consequently, cannot be placed prior to the Middle phase.

We are thankful for this information about the stratigraphic placement of the coin to our former student Dr. I. Kellellu non senior lecturer in Ancient Indian History, culture nd Archaeology at the Nagpur University, who participated in the excavations at the site from the very start.

107. Mention may be made here of a Roman lead bulla found in the excavations at Veerāpuram (Kurnool district, Andhra Pradesh) which was initially interpreted as a joint monetary issue of the Sātavāhana king Hakusiri and the contemporary Roman emperor Tiberius, and if one were to concede this ascription, it would have furnished yet another stratigraphic proof for the rise of the Sātavāhanas in the latter half of the first century BC (*Excavation Exploration Bulletin*, No. 1, Birla Archaeological and Cultural Research Institute, Hyderabad, p. 24. The author indulges in wild speculation regarding the Sātavāhana monarch's conjectured sojourn to the Roman empire). However, as we pointed out long back, it was just an imitation of a Tiberius coin for wearing as a pendant (*vide* our ''Pre-Sātavāhana and Sātavāhana Coinage of the Deccan'', Presidential Address of the 69th Session of the Numismatic Society of India, Sambalpur, 1981, *JNSI*, XLIV, p. 8). The excavators themselves later abandoned this position. See T.V.G. Sastri, M. Kasturi Bai and J. Vara Prasada Rao, *Veerāpuram: A Type-Site for Cultural Study of the Kṛishṇā Valley*, Birla Archaeological and Cultural Reserach Institute, Hyderabad, 1984, pp. 86-87, where the object is called a Roman bulla).

108. For instance, K. Gopalachari (*CHI*, II, p. 301) places Sātakarṇi I's reign between *c.* 212 and 195 BC.

109. Ajay Mitra Shastri in S.B. Deo and J.P. Joshi, *Paunī Excavation*, Nagpur University, 1972, pp. 99-100.

110. S.B. Deo, ''A New Type of Sri Satakarni'', *Early Indian Indigenous Coins*, ed. D.C. Sircar, University of Calcutta, 1971, pp. 111-12.

111. *Vide supra* note 108.

112. For a general account of these coins, see *JNSI*, XLIV, pp. 1-4.

113. *Vide ibid.*, pp. 4-5; P.V. Parabrahma Sastry, ''Unknown Coins of Sātavāhanas and their Predecessors'', *ND*, II(I), pp. 13-17. Eleven other coins of pre-Sātavāhana age giving some hitherto unknown names have been published by D. Raja Reddy and P. Suryanarayana Reddy (''Some Rare Pre-Sātavāhana Coins of the Deccan'', *NS*, II, 1992, pp. 57-61).

114. Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Coins of Satyabhadra : A Hitherto Unknown King of Vidarbha'', *ABORI*, Diamond Jubilee Volume, pp. 163-67; Narayan Deshmukh, ''Coin of Surya Mitra from Paunār'', *ND*, XI, pp. 20-21; Ajay Mitra Shastri and Chandrashekhar Gupta, ''Mitra and Bhadra Coins from Vidarbha'', *Nidhi*, Indian Coin Society, Nagpur, I, 1990. pp. 9-24; Chandrashekhar Gupta, ''Copper Punch-marked Coins of Damabhadra from Kauṇḍinyapura Excavations'', *NS*, I, pp. 19-26; Amarendra Nath, ''Some Observations on the Chronology of the Bhadras and Mitras of Vidarbha'', *JNSI*, LII, pp. 48-57.

115. Ajay Mitra Shastri and Chandrashekhar Gupta, in *Nidhi*, I, pp. 12-13.

116. Alaka Tiwari, ''Inscribed Punch-Marked Coins from Eran and Vidisa Region'', *ND*, IV(I), 1980, pp. 1-8; ''Daśārṇa Kshetra kī Lipi-yukta Ahata Mudraeṁ'' (Hindi), *JNSI*, XLIII (I), p. 3.

117. R.R. Bhargava, ''Two New Coins from Tripurī'', *ND*, XII-XIII, pp. 6-8; ''Coins of the Datta and Sātavāhana Rulers from Tripurī'', *ibid.*, pp. 29-35.

118. Amarendra Nath, ''Adam—An Index to Vidarbha Archaeology", *New Trends in Indian Art and Archaeology: S.R. Rao's 70th Birthday Felicitation Volume*, eds. B.U. Nayak and N.C. Ghosh, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 1992, p. 76; *JNSI*, LII, pp. 48-51 (for Bhadra coins from Aḍam).

119. It is likely that in certain areas cast specie preceded the punch-marked ones.

120. D.C. Sircar, *AIU*, p. 159; P.L. Gupta, ''A Further Note on the Identity of Kings Sātavāhana and Sāti'', *JNSI*, XVI, pp. 86-87; *Punch-Marked Coins in Andhra Pradesh Government Museum*, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh Government Museum Series, No. I, Hyderbad, 1961, pp. 31-33.

121. The vogue of die-striking technique also is a pointer in the same direction, for while possibly this minting technique itself evolved indigenously, it was popularised by contact with Indo-Greeks.

122. *EHD*, p. 44.

123. *IA*, XLVII, p. 71.

124. As shown above, this designation was wrongly applied to the Sātavāhanas by R.G. Bhandarkar.

125. The exact wording of stanza is as follows:

Śuṅgānāṁ chaiv (or ch-āpi) yach=chheshaṁ (or yach=chhishtaṁ) kshapayitvā (or kshapitvā) balīyasaḥ (or *balaṁ tadā*).

Vide Pargiter, *op.cit.*, p. 38, lines 3-4 in both the columns.

126. The first line of the stanza in question in the *Matsya*, *Vaȳu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* as reconstructed by Pargiter runs as follows:

Amātyo Vasudevas=tu bālyād vyasaninaṁ nṛipam

The next line of this verse and the first line of the next stanza is read in the *Matsya* as : *Devabhūmim=tāth-otsādya Śuṅgas=tu bhavitā nṛipah*

and in the *Vāyu* as

Devabhūmim tath-otpātya Śuṅgeshu bhavitā nṛipah

In both the texts Vasudeva is called 'a Śuṅga king' or 'a king among the Śuṅgas', which is certainly due to defective manuscript tradition. The correct reading in both the cases should have been and perhaps was something like *Śuṅgaṁ tu*. This is at least a reading met with in one of the *Matsya* manuscripts and in the *Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa* text (*vide* Pargiter, *op.cit.*, p. 34, notes 6 and 8) and it qualified *Devabhūmiṅ* met with earlier in the same stanza.

The comparison between the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas on the one hand and the Marāṭhās and the Peshwās on the other is incongruous even otherwise. In the latter case the sovereigns were Marāṭhās and the usurpers (Peshwās) Brāhmaṇas, while in the former case both were Brāhmins.

127. ''Andhra History and Culture'', *ZDMG*, 1902, p. 657.

128. *EHDY*, p. 86.

129. *MSGH*, I. p. 64.

130. Unless it is proved that the longer list ruling over a longer duration was compiled in the Deccan, even the idea of ignorance resulting in a distorted picture cannot just be entertained. And as of now we have no such evidence.

131. There is nothing sanctimonious about the number 'thirty' which has made some scholars take recourse to some apologetic tricks to accommodate additional kings (*DKA*, p. 36 where Sātakarṇi known from some of the Purāṇas is inserted as no. 24a as otherwise the number would go beyond 30) or reject the existence of a king altogether (*vide* V.V. Mirashi, "The Identity of the Sātavāhana King Śivāsrī Puḷumāvi'', *JNSI*, XXXI, pp. 151-54, where the separate identity of Śivâsrī has been denied totally and merged with Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi for the same reason though the same scholar had earlier conceded his independent existence).

132. These must be taken as only *approximate figures* and not exact and sacrosanct as some future evidence may necessitate some alteration which is not likely to be substantial.

133. *EHAC*, p. 38; *CHI*, II, p. 303.

134. K.N. Dikshit, ''A New Andhra Coin'', *Numismatic Supplement* (incorporated in in *JASB*),

No. XLVII, pp. 93-94; Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Three Sātavāhana Mints'', *SSIC*, IV, pp. 57-62.

135. We have seen a couple of such coins from Mallār now in the Collection of the M.G.M. Museum, Bilāspur, which are under publication by us.

136. They Contain the same mint-mark which is also found on all the coins struck at this mint. *Vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri and Anand Kumar Risbud, ''Magha Coins from Mallār'', *ND*, IX, pp. 34-40; R.R. Bhargava, ''Numismatic History of Malhār'', *ibid.*, XIX.

137. This, and not Kosala, is the correct form which is met with in all the epigraphs mentioning it.

138. The second component of the name there is spelt beginning with palatal sibilant (Śātakarṇi) and not with a dental one (Sātakarṇi) which is the correct form in all cases.

139. Chakora is mentioned as a mountain forming part of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi's dominions in the Nāsik inscription of the 19th year of his son and successor Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi. *Vide HISWK*, p. 45, line 3.

140. *Vide PHAI*, with a commentary by B.N. Mukherjee, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1996, p. 360, fn. 1; *AIU*, p. 200.

141. Mentioned in the larger Nāṇeghāt inscription as the reigning king (*HISWK*, p. 11, line 1) and later as a son of Nāganikā (*ibid.*, p. 12, line 4).

142. Under the name Satisiri he is named as a son of Nāganikā in the Nāṇeghaāt sacrificial inscription (*ibid.*) and a few coins issued by him as a prince called Śaktikumāra and later as a ruler.

143. For a discussion on their coins and early place in the Sātavāhana history, *vide* Amiteshwar Jha, "Bearing of the Numismatic Evidence on the Purāṇic Sequence of Sātavāhana Kings", *Infra*, No. B (Ed.), *The Age of the Sātavāhanas.*

144. He is known only from his silver portrait issues of the usual type.

145. For a discussion on the unique significance of these coins and the place of their issuers among the Sātavāhanas, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, *EHDPP*, pp. 38-44.

146. *EHD*, pp. 46-47.

147. *Prādhānyataḥ pravakshyāmi* of the *Vāyu* actually refers to the main (*pradhāna*) branch of the family.

148. Gautamīputra (Sātakarni) and Yajñaśrī (Yajña Sātakarṇi) are at nos. 13 and 14 respectively in the *Vāyu* list and the names intervening and proved historical otherwise have altogether been dropped. It has aroused some unfortunate and unsupported theories; but the omission is purely due to inadvertence on the part of Purāṇic copyists.

For the two (*Matsya and Vāyu*) lists, see *EHDY*, p. 85.

149. Under the variant Apīlavā as no. 4.

150. As no. 11.

151. *Vide* Nāsik inscription of Gautamīputra's 18th year granting a field owned till recently

by Ṛishabhadatta, son-in-law of Nahāpana (*HISWK*, pp. 26-27); Kārle inscription of a nearby date granting a village earlier granted by Ṛishabhadatta (*ibid.*, pp. 30-31); Nāsik inscription of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi's 19th year describing his father as uprooter of the Kshaharāta line (*Khakharāta-vasa-niravasesa-kara*), see *ibid.*, p. 45, line 6; silver specie of Nahapāna restruck by Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi with his own devices and inscriptions, *vide* H.R. Scott, ''The Nasik (Joghaltembhi) Hoard of Nahapāna's Coins'', *JBBRAS*, XXII, 1907, pp. 223-44; Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Jogalthambī Hoard of Nahapana's Silver Portrait Coins: Some Observations'', *ND*, XIX; Michael Mitchiner, ''A Small Hoard of Nahapāna-Gautamīputra Silver Coins Double Pierced for Use as Jewellery'', *NS*, IV, 1996, pp. 63-68; Amiteshwar Jha and Dilip Rajgor, *Studies in the Coinage of the Western Kṣatrapas*, Indian Institute of Research in Numismatic Studies, Anjaneri, 1994, pp. 26-27. That the war was protracted over a long period with alternate success is established by some coins of Gautamīputra counterstruck by Nahapāna. *Vide* Shobhana Gokhale, ''Origins and Influences of Sātavāhana Coins'', *Infra*, No. 16.

152. Nahapāna's inscriptions are dated in his regnal years (42-46) and his long reign is vouched for by his portraits of different phases of life on his coins. That Nahapāna preceded Chashṭana is conceded by all the historians and is shown by epigraphic and numismatic considerations. For Chashṭana starting Śaka era or the latter marking his accession, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Saka Era'', *IJHS*, XXXI(I), pp. 67-88.

153. It was most probably the town of Minnagar of the author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (R.C. Majumdar, *The Classical Acounts of India*, Firma KLM Pvt. Limited, Calcutta, reprint, 1981,p. 301) which was the capital of Mambarus or Nahapaṇa. It was so called because of its situation in the valley of the river Mina which is still called Minner. The presence of an inscription of Nahapāna's minister *(amacha)* Ayama (Aryaman) at Junnar is also a pointer in the same direction. For the epigraph, *vide HISWK*, inscription no. 44. For a discussion, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Yavanas in Western Indian Cave Inscriptions'', *Yavanikā*, III, 1993, pp. 62-63.

154. Shobhana Gokhale, ''New Discoveries in the Sātavāhana Coinage'', *Indian Numismatics : Art & Culture* (Essays in Honour of Dr. Parmeshwri Lal Gupta), eds. D.W. Macdowall, Savita Sharma and Sanjay Garg, Agam Kala Prakashan, Delhi, 1992, pp. 179-82.

155. *Ibid.*, p. 181, coin no. 3. There is need of a better, more faithful description of coins which we propose to undertake elsewhere shortly.

156. For Vidarbha (Paunī) coin, see Prashant Kulkarni in *Indian Coin Society's Newsletter*, no. 1.

157. For the description of these types sitewise and elaboration of the chronological deductions from these coins, see Amiteshwar Jha, ''Bearing of Numismatic Evidence on the Purāṇic Sequence of Sātavāhana Kings'', *Infra*, No. 18

158. For the author's earlier writings on the subject, *vide* ''The Epoch of the Sātavāhana Rule : A Re-Appraisal'', *Coinage of the Sātavāhanas and Coins from Excavations*, ed. Ajay Mitra Shastri, Nagpur University, 1972, pp. 103-9; ''Pre-Sātavāhana and Sātavāhana

Coinage of the Deccan'', *JNSI*, XLIV, pp. 7-8; *EHDPP*, pp. 3-11; ''Dating Potential of Early Sātavāhana Coins'', *Numismatics and Archaeology*, eds. P.L. Gupta and A.K. Jha, Indian Institute of Research in Numismatic Studies, Anjaneri, 1987, pp. 89-92. Some of the views expressed in these publications have undergone minor alterations here in the light of fresh discoveries. For our latest position elaborated with all details, *vide* our forthcoming publication *The Sātavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas: A Historical Framework*, Ch. V.

159. The copyists were not always well educated and versed in the language, and the manuscripts made available for copying were also not always in a good condition and must have been, at least sometimes, greatly soiled. The result was that often there were distortions even regarding such vital points as personal names and the regnal periods with wide variations hampering the task of modern histroians.

160. Vide *DKA*, p. 38, fns. 1, 17, 19-20, for variant readings. For the name Chhismaka, *vide ibid.*, fns. 19-20.

161. For another instance of the reading of a single manuscript being correct and preferable as against all the reast, see Ajay Mitra Shastri, *India as seen in the Kuṭṭani-mata of Dāmodaragupta*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1975, pp. 65-67; ''The Reading and Interpretation of a Verse in the Kuṭṭanī-mata in the Light of Archaeological and Purāṇic Evidence'', *Purāṇam*, XIII, pp. 60-66.

162. This form of the name is noticed on his coins spotted at Koṭaliṅgāla and Sangāreḍḍy in the Karīmnagar district of Andhra Pradesh and Paunār in the Wardhā district of Maharashtra.

163. A short label inscription at Nāṇeghāṭ in the Sātavāhana statue gallery furnishes this form. This gallery was initiated by his younger brother Kṛishṇa with the installation of his dead elder brother's statue in the cave as will be shown shortly.

164. *HISWK*, p. 20, no. 4.

165. The word *Vāsithi* in the metronymic Vāsiṭhiputa is found transformed into *Vāchiṭṭi* in the reverse legend on the silver portrait coins of the kings who had this metronymic and cared to mint such specie. *Ksh* (a combination of *k* and *sh*) is found altered into *chh* in the name Chavata (Ṛikshavat): actually *sh* into *chh* as the initial *k* of *ksh* would be automatically dropped in Prakrit: in the Nāsik inscription of the 19th year of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi. Later the names *Śānta* and Śāntamūla are found transformed into Chāṁta and Chātamūla respectively (the former being the owner of a copper jar with a large number of silver punch-marked coins and the latter an Ikshvāku monarch). For other instances and discussion, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Presidential Address'', *PIHC*, XXXIX Session, Hyderabad, 1978, p. 969.

165a. The retention of sibilant in the second component is just inexplicable and there may be other such instances as well.

166. It is equally possible that it may represent some Telugu word like Pulumāvi.

167. For these coins, *vide supra* note 36.

168. *Indian Coin Society's Newsletter*, No. 1.

169. M. Rama Rao, *Sātavāhana Coins in the Andhra Pradesh Government Museum,* Hyderabad, 1961, p. 12; P.L. Gupta, N.D. II (II), 1978, p. 32. Amiteshwar Jha, (''Bearing of Numismatic Evidence on the Purāṇic Sequence of Sātavāhana Kings, *infra*, No. 18.'') also seems to favour that the Sātavāhana of coins was the founder of the dynasty on typological grounds. However, these scholars refrained from guessing the number of generations preceding Simuka. Mirashi (*HISWK*, pp. [7,] [16-17]) felt that he flourished one or two generations before Simuka, while A.S. Altekar held that the latter was his son.

170. S.B. Deo, ''New Coins of King Sātavāhana'', *JNSI*, XXII, pp. 138-45, where all the coins of this king are described and attributed to Kumāra Sātavāhana. For an updated list of coins of king Sātavāhana, see Chandrashekhar Gupta, ''A Potin Coin of King Sātavāhana from the Deccan'', *SSIC*, III, 1993, pp. 73-80. For the label, *vide HISWK*, p. 20, no. 9.

171. The Nāṇeghāṭ sacrificial inscription being very fragmentary, there is absolutely nothing in it to warrant that this Sātavāhana was a son of Sātakarṇi and Nāganikā.

172. *Vide DKA*, p. 35, at the end of the acount of the Kāṇvas. The exact wording is *bhūmir Andhrān gamishyati* or *bhūr=Andhrāṇāṁ bhavishyati.*

173. *HISWK* p. 20, no. 9.

174. The personages whose figures were set up include Simuka Sātavāhana, queen Nāyanikā and king Sātakarṇi, *Kumāra* Bhāya, *Mahārathi* Tranakayira, *Kumāra* Hakusiri, *Kumāra* Sātavāhana and two other individuals whose names also are not extant and about whom a lot of guesswork has been made. Of these, family associations of *Kumāra* Bhāya and Mahāraṭhi Tranakayira are not ascertainable, but they were undoubtedly closely associated with the Sātavāhanas.

175. A.S. Altekar, *MSGH*, I, p. 62. All other historians of the Sātavāhanas have taken it for granted.

176. A.D. Pusalkar, *Bhāsa—A Study*, 2nd revised edn., Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1968, p. 242. The question is asked as to whether the figures of the living persons also are installed and the answer is a firm no :

dharamāṇānām=api pratimāh sthāpyante... na khalu, atikrāntānām=eva.

177. For his coins from Sannati, *vide* I.K. Sarma, "Lead Coins of King Sātavāhana from Sannati", *SSIC*, III, pp. 65-72. Sannati is a prominent archaeologial site and has yielded, besides these coins, Aśokan and Sātavāhana inscriptions. For these records, see I.K.Sarma and J. Vara Prasada Rao, *Inscriptions from Sannati*, Harman Publishing House, New Delhi, 1993.

178. *DKA*, p. 38, and fn. 2.

179. V.S. Bakhle, *op.cit.*, p. 46; A.S. Altekar, *op.cit.*, p. 62; Gurty Venkat Rao, *op.cit.*, pp. 89-90, etc.

180. V.S. Bakhle, *op. cit.*, p. 49; G.V. Rao, *op.cit.*, pp. 89-90 (he treats Puḷumāvi I as a very powerful king); O. Ramachandraiya, *op.cit.*, pp. 23-24.

181. A.S. Altekar, *op.cit.*, p. 78 (according to him, Sātakarṇi was the correct form of the name.

182. I.K. Sarma, *op.cit.*, p. 10.

183. The usages are *Sādavāhana-kula* (Nāsik inscr. of Kaṇha), *Sātavāhana-kula* (Nāsik *prasasti* of Gautamī Balaśrī of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi's 19th year), and Sātavāhanas in plural (Sātavāhanānaṁ, 'of the Sātavāhanas', in Aḍoṇī inscr. of Puḷumāvi, year 8, which is the last known epigraph of the family).

His younger brother Kṛishṇa's description as belonging to the *Sādavāhana-kula*, 'the Sādavāhana family', in the Nasik record of his reign (*HISWK*, p. 2, line 1) suggests, according to some scholars, that the family could not have been called after his elder brother Simuka Sātavāhana and that Sātavāhana whose name was given to the dynasty must have preceded him by at least one or two generations (*ibid.*, p. 1). But a younger brother might well have prided in the achievements of his elder brother and predecessor whom he had succeeded and named the family after him.

184. *Hatvā Kāṇvaṁ Suśarmāṇaṁ tad-bhṛityo vṛishalo balī/*

Gāṁ bhokshyaty-Andhra-jātīyaḥ kañchit kālam=asattamah//

DKA, p. 38, fn. 2.

185. In Gautamī Balaśrī's Nasik inscr. her son is styled so, and the expression is commonly taken in this sense. D.R. Bhandarkar's view which is against it and is followed by K. Gopalachari has not met with general acceptance.

186. *DKA*, p. 38.

187. Strangely enough, H.C. Raychaudhuri, an upholder of shorter chronology, observes that 'Simuka assailed the last Kānva king Susarman' whose reign he places in *c.* 40-30 BC (*PHAI*, p. 406) and yet places Simuka's reign in c. 60-37 BC and that of his brother Kṛishṇa in *c.* 37-27 BC (*ibid.*, p. 414).

For how Simuka could get corrupted into Śiśuka, Sindhuka, etc., into defective manuscript tradition from a palaeographical point of view, *vide* K.V. Ramesh, *Indian Epigraphy*, Sundeep Prakashan, Delhi, 1984, pp. 114-15.

188. Surprisingly K.V. Ramesh (*ibid.*, p. 115) observes that he is mentioned as Kṛishṇa-Sātakarṇi in the *Vāyu* and as Mallakarṇi in the *Matsya* and feels that *Malla-* had resulted from the re-copyist's wrong restoration of *Sāta-*. However, this observation has no support from the Purāṇas all of which unanimously mention him as Kṛishṇa alone and is entirely due to confusion with the next name which is mentioned in many a *Matsya* manuscript as Mallakarṇi instead of Sātakarṇi as we shall see in the sequel.

189. *DKA*, p. 39.

190. H.C. Raychauchuri (*PHAI*, p. 414) and A.S. Altekar (*MSGH*, I, pp. 78-79) feel that the latter reading (viz. ten years) is the correct one, and the latter argues that he could not have ruled for more than ten years, for his elder brother had already ruled for twenty-three years. However, the contention is simply untenable as even among the Sātavāhanas themselves, not be speak of other ruling families, there are instances of a much longer

duration than the combined length of these two reigns, e.g. Sātakarṇi who is given fifty-six years unanimously.

191. *Vide HISWK*, p. 2.

192. D. Raja Reddy, ''Coin of Sātavāhana King Kṛishṇa'', *ND*, VII, 1983, pp. 24-26 (its attribution is somewhat doubtful, *vide ibid.*, editorial note); Amiteshwar Jha and P.D. Chumble, ''Rare Coins of Sātavāhana King Kṛishṇa'', *Ex Moneta Essays on Numismatics, History and Archaeology in Honour of Dr. D.W. Macdowall*, eds. A.K. Jha and Sanjay Garg, Nāsik , 1995, pp. 147-49. These coins come from Junnar which has yielded some other important early Sātavāhana and Kshaharāta coins as well. However, the attribution is very doubtful.

193. Gurty Venkat Rao in *EHDY*, p. 114.

194. This is our suggestion which has been elaborated critically in our paper ''Sātavāhana Statue Gallery at Nāṇeghāṭ'' presented at the Third World Archaeology Congress held at New Delhi on 4-11 January, 1995. The paper is yet to be published.

195. *Op.cit.*, p. 53.

196. *HISWK*, p. 18, fn. 1.

197. *DKA*, p. 39; *EHD*, p. 45; *BMC, AWK*, introduction, p. ixvi; *EHDY*, p. 85. Other variants of the name noted by Pargiter are Śāntakarṇa, Śāntakarṇi, Śāntavarṇa, Śālakarṇi, Śālaparṇi, Mālakaṇī and Mālakarṇi. *Vide DKA*, p. 39, fn. 29. We have just ignored the palatization of the initial sibilant of the name (Śātakarṇi for Satakarṇi).

198. Except R.G. Bhandarkar (*EHD*, p. 45 where the name is given as Mallakarṇi who is assigned a reign of 10 or 18 years) all the rest give ten years as his regnal period. Obviously some of the mss. consulted by Bhandarkar have the reading 18. In any case it is not supported by any of the readings given by Pargiter who has noted that the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa* have the readings *mahān*, 'great', instead of any figure, and a *Matsya* manuscript has the word *samāḥ*, 'years', instead of the figure, so that according to this text the years were intended to be specified but have actually not been. *Vide DKA*, p. 39, fn. 31.

199. Other variants of the name are Pūrṇotsarga, Pūrṇāsaṅga *(Matsya)*, Pūrṇosantu *(Vāyu)*, Pūrṇeshaṅga, Vasukarṇṇotsaṅga *(Vishnu)*, and Paurṇamāsa, Pūrṇāsaga followed by *tatsutah*, 'his son' *(Bhāgavata)*. *Vide ibid.*, p. 39, fn. 32.

200. Other readings of the name are Skandastabhi, Svivasvani and Śovastuti (all *Matsya* which alone has this line).

201. The name is invariably preceded by the honorific *śrī* which has often been, but should not be, taken to form a part of the name, viz. Śrī-Sātakarṇi.

201a. But *eVāyu*, going by pargiter (*ibid.*, p. 39, fn. 32) seems to be aware of Pūrṇotsaṅga there called Pūrṇotsantu.

202. Pargiter (*ibid.*, p. 36) avers that Sātakarṇi (No. 3 of his list) is mentioned in 'all *Vāyu* Mss., other than *eh* Vā'. E.J. Rapson (*BMC, AWK*, p. lxvi) also mentions Śrī-Sātakarṇi as referred to in the *Vāyu*. But his omission from the *Vāyu* list of Sātavāhana kings by

R.G. Bhandarkar (*EHD*, p. 45) shows that the manuscripts of the Purāṇa consulted by him did not contain his name.

203. The *Vāyu* manuscript(s) consulted by Rapson (*BMC, AWK*, p. lxvi) were reported to be reticent regarding the period of his rule.

204. He is generally called Sātakarṇi II by historians.

205. *DKA*, p. 39. *Vide* also *ibid.*, p. 39, fns. 38-39 which do not mention any reading affecting in any way this period.

206. *Vide ibid.*, p. 39, fn. 40 which avers that there are 'no marked variations in this name. However, a *Vaȳu* manuscript (called *m*Vā by Pargiter) reads *tasya putraḥ*, 'his son', which may be significant though the exact nature of the significance cannot be ascertained at present.

207. Nāganikā or Nāyanikā is in all probability an abridged form of the name Nāgavaradāyinī met with in her son Vediśrī's Nāṇeghāṭ inscription (*vide* D.C. Sircar, *SI*, p. 194, line 5). This form is met with in the legend on coins issued by her jointly with her husband Sātakarṇi which clearly show that they were related to each other as wife and husband. The acceptance of our view that Nāgavaradāyinī was the full form of her name will also prove that the larger Nāṇeghāṭ record actually belonged to the Sātavāhanas, which has been doubted by some scholars (*vide* P.L. Gupta, ''Nāneghāṭ Inscription of an Unknown Queen—A Historical Study'', ''*Studies in Indian Epigraphy*'' *(JESI)*, II, 1975, pp. 59-71.

208. The preserved portion appears to indicate that these sacrifices were observed by queen Nāgavaradāyinī herself; but according to ancient Indian practice, she must have undertaken these sacrifices jointly with her spouse. The highly damaged state of this inscription has resulted into the loss of most important portions including names of personages which has aroused wild, baseless speculations and historical reconstruction. For the text of the inscription, *vide* D.C. Sircar, *SI*, I, pp. 193-97; *HISWK*, pp. 11-15.

209. These are the names still intact; there is possibility of several other names of sacrifices that may have been lost. Costly fees *(dakshiṇās)* offered to priests and presents to others have also been meticulously specified.

The inscription mentions second Aśvamedha so that what is certain is that at least two Aśvamedhas were performed. We do not know if there were more.

210. *Dutiye cha vase achitayitā Sātakaṁinim̐ pachhima-disaṁ haya-gaja-nara-ratha-bahulaṁ daṁiḍaṁ paṭhāpayati....* D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, I, p. 215, line 4.

211. The Hathigumphā inscription of Khāravela, which is our only source of information on this point, only avers that his army frightened Asikanagara which we have identified with modern Aḍam, Nagpur district, which during excavations has yielded extraordinarily rich material comparable only to that from Taxila. The Sātavāhana inscriptions are quite reticent about this event.

212. Such metronymics were quite common among the commoners and aristocratic sections of the society from much earlier times.

213. *HISWK*, pp. 3-4.

214. R.C. Majumdar (Ed.). *The Classical Accounts of India*, p. 301, para no. 41. Elsewhere he speaks of Soupara (Sopārā) also as an important port of Indo-Roman trade.

215. The Greek spelling is suggested to be a corruption of Sātakarṇi. H.C. Raychaudhuri (*PHAI*, p. 416) feels that it was derived through some Prakrit form like Sāḍagaṇṇa. Even otherwise the form Saraganus can be obtained, for *ta* can get transformed into *da* as *t* and *d* are interchangeable in the Prakrit of Sātavāhana epigraphic and numismatic records and *k* and *g* may also get exchanged. Thus Sadagani or Satakani can also lead to the form Saraganus.

216. Some historians including G.V. Rao, however, equate him with the second king of that name and thus obviate a number of difficulties.

217. He obviously follows the readings adopted by Pargiter (*op.cit.*, p. 39, line 6) and not the readings of non-*Matsya* texts (18 years) given by Bhandarkar (*op.cit.*, p. 45) and Rapson (*op. cit.*, p. 1xvi) following the *Brahmāṇḍa*.

218. *HISWK*, p. [24].

219. It is noteworthy in the present context that the *Vāyu* manuscripts are reticent about the duration of his reign which might indicate that the *purāṇakāras* were uncertain on this point.

220. The reticence of the larger Nāṇeghaṭ inscription about Kṛishṇa and the absence of his portrait in the family's statue-house (*pratimā-gṛiha*) at Nāṇeghāṭ have led to some strange undocumented notions about him. Some historians have conjectured inimical relations between Simuka and his younger brother Krishṇa. V.S. Bakhle (*op.cit.*, p. 53), for instance, observes that 'Kaṇha was an usurper after Simuka's death' at the cost of the latter's son Sātakarṇi whose claims he overrode and that is why he has been ignored in the larger Nāṇeghāṭ inscription and his figure was not put up in the cave. This feeling is also shared by V.V. Mirashi (*HISWK*, p. 18, fn.1) who compares the relations between the two brothers to those between the Badāmī Chālukya kings Kīrtivarman I and Maṅgaleśa the latter of whom thwarted the accession of his nephew and rightful claimant Pulakeśin II. A.S. Altekar and K. Gopalachari also follow the same views which are based on unwarranted assumptions of G. Bühler followed by, *inter alia*, E.J. Rapson. It is pertinent to note in this context that the larger Nāṇeghāt inscription is too much mutilated, especially at crucial places, and much of the information ascribed to this record is purely conjectural and hypothetical. There may have been some statements which have been lost irreparably and there may not have been many things assumed by modern historians and epigraphists. Then, as demonstrated in these pages, the view that all the figures were installed at the same time or during the same reign by Sātakarṇi or Nāganikā is not at all acceptable. It is also extremely doubtful if Kṛishṇa's statue was dropped consciously and was not there. For, two of the labels are lost and it was, as shown above, Kṛishṇa himself who inaugurated the statue-gallery by installing his deceased brother Simuka's statue and his own figure must have been put up by his son Sātakarṇi and those of Nāganikā and her spouse Sātakarṇi by their son Vediśrī. It is impossible at present to determine the personages responsible for installing other figures.

221. Like Śivaśrī where the honorific was suffixed, instead of being prefixed, to the royal names (Śiva and Yajña). Both these practices were current in ancient India and instances are too numerous to be enumerated exhaustively.

222. In this instance also Vedi alone was the name with the honorific (*siri* or *śrī*) suffixed to it.

223. Ten years according to a *Matsya* manuscript. *Vide DKA*, p. 39, fn. 41.

224. *Ibid.*, p. 39, line 10.

225. We get various forms of the name, some of the more important ones being Apītaka, Apīlaka, Āpīlavā, Apolava, Āpolava, Apalaka, Arpālaka, Āryālaka, Āpādaba, Āpāstavā, Chivilaka, Chibilaka, Chilibaka, Chilibika, Vichilaka, Vivilaka, Vikala, Ghilibaka, etc. Pargiter notes that sometimes (*Vishṇu)* we have *tasmādāpilaka,* etc., where *d* of *tasmāt(d)* is joined to the name. *Vide ibid.*, p. 39, fn. 45. As he also notes, Āpīlaka appears to be the best form and, as we shall see in the sequel, is vouched for by certain coins. There is nothing to support the 'contention' of K.V. Ramesh that the original name of the king was Śrīhālaka with the honorific *śrī* prefixed and *ka-* suffixed so that the correct form was Hāla (*op.cit.*, p. 116).

226. Other variants are Meghasvāmī, Medhasvāti, Saṁgha, Saṁghasvāpi, Maghasvāti and Meghaghāti. *Vide DKA*, p. 40, fn. 47.

227. The form Svāmi is also met with. This name is found only in *Matsya* (*vide ibid.*, p. 40, fn. 48). The form Āti with a reign of twelve years is met with in *e*Vā. See *ibid.*, p. 40, right column, line 12 and fn. 52.

228. Skandhasvāti, Skandasvāmī and Skaṁvastrāṇi are other forms. See *ibid.*, p. 40, line 4, fn. 53.

229. For the first part of the name we have the variants Bhagendra, Mahendra and Narendra and for the second one Svātivarṇa, Sātikarṇa and Sātakarṇi, the last one found in *e*Vā manuscript of the *Vāyu* being the correct one. See *ibid.*, p. 40, line 15 and fns. 56-57. *Vide* also fn. 58 which invites attention to *n*Mt manuscript of the *Matsya* which mistakenly mentions twenty-five years *(varshāṇi pañchaviṁśati)* which actually should go with Arishṭakarṇa in line 19.

230. Kuśala and Ksettula are alternative readings of the first component and Śāntikarṇa and Sātakarṇi of the second. *Vide ibid.*, p. 40, line 16, and fns. 60-61.

231. Svātikarṇa, Svātikoṇa, Svātikeṇa, Svātishena, Syātisena and Sātikarṇa are other divergent spellings of the name. See *ibid.*, p. 40, line 17, and fn. 65.

232. As we have seen above, this has the largest number of varying forms showing its non-Sanskritic origins. K.V. Ramesh (*op.cit.*, pp. 116-17) calls him the ninth king, on which authority we do not know, but rightly points out that Puḷumāvi is the correct and original spelling and adduces palaeographical considerations for some of the copyists' (or re-copyists') errors.

233. As per the majority of the *Matsya*. But a solitary manuscript has shaḍgiṁśa which is taken to be an error for *shadvimśa.*=26 years by Pargiter. *Shadvimśa* is also found in a *Matsya* manuscript. *Vide ibid.*, p. 40, left column, line 18, and fn. 66.

234. This is as per the majority of the *Vāyu* and *Brahmaṇḍa* manuscripts. But *eVā* manuscript of the former, which often gives more reliable readings, has *chatustriṁśat*=34 years. See *ibid.*, p. 40, right column, line 18 and fn. 68.

235. The variations of the name include Nemikṛishna, Nemikasma, Naurikvikṛishṇa, Naurikarṇa, Nārikarṇa, Saurikarṇa, Arishṭauvik, Gaurikarṇa, Gaurakṛitsva, Ariktavarṇa, Ariktakarṇa, Arishṭakarṇi, Arishṭakarmā and Anishṭakarmā. As pointed out by Pargiter, it is 'impossible to extract the correct name out of this confusion' and Arishṭakarṇa has been adopted only 'as the most central form'. *Vide ibid.*, p. 40, line 19 and fn. 70.

236. According to the reading of a *Matsya* manuscript called *j*Mt by Pargiter *(ibid.*, p. 41, fn. 71), he ruled only for six months (*shaṇ-māsān vai bhavishyati*).

237. The other allied forms of the name are Hala, Hāleya, Hālela, Hālena and Hālaya. See *ibid.*, p. 41, line 20, fn. 73.

238. According to the *Matsya*, *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa*, he ruled only for one full year. *Vide ibid.*, p. 41, fn. 72 *(saṁvatsaraṁ pūrṇam)*.

239. Other variants of the name include Mandulaka, Mantalaṁka, Menulaka, Maṇḍalaka, Maṇḍaka, Kuṇḍalaka, Pantalaka, Pittalaka, Puttalaka, Pakshalaka, Prabhulaka, Prattalaka, Talaka, Tanaka, Halaka, Śūlaka, Saptaka, Saptaṁka and Masaka. As observed by Pargiter, 'Mantalaka or Pattalaka seems the most likely form, from which the other readings might have been derived by misreadings' *Vide ibid.*, p. 41, line 21 and fn. 74. Rapson (*BMC, AWK*, p. lxvii) notices two other readings, viz. Bhāvaka and Tālaka. For other possible readings, *vide* K.V. Ramesh, *op.cit.*, pp. 117-18.

240. His name is also spelt as Purīndrasenī, Purinasena, Puraṇḍa, Pulindrasena, Pulindrāsena, Purīndasena, Pullasena, Pravillasena, Pravilasena and Pravilisena, *vide DKA*, p. 41, line 24, fn. 79.

241. Its variants include Purīkasena, Purikāshana, Purīkkeṇu, Putrikasheṇa, Purīshaseru, Purikabheru, Purikabhoru, Purikabhāru, and Purikabhīru. These variations suggest the name Purushasena to Pargiter. See *ibid.*, p. 41 and fn. 80.

242. According to *e*Vā manuscript of the *Vāyu* (*samā dvādaśa bhū*tale), 12 years. *Vide ibid.*, p. 41, fn. 82.

243. Sundhara is another variant. The *Bhāgavata/and a Vishṇu manuscript* spell it as Sunandana which seems to be supported by the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, as will be seen in the sequence. Some of the texts give the king's name only as Sātakarṇi which is misspelt as Śantakīrtti in a manuscript of the *Vāyu*. *Vide* for the variants, *ibid.*, p. 41, fns. 83 and 85.

244. The first part of the name is also spelt variously also as Chakara, Chākākara, and Rājāda. A *Matsya* manuscript gives the name as Vikarṇa. A *Vishṇu* manuscript gives the name only as Sātakarṇi. The only worth mentioning variant of the second component is Svātikarṇa found in the *Matsya*. *Vide ibid.*, p. 42, fn. 88 which lists severral divergent redings.

245. Śikhasvāti, Śiraḥsvāti, Śivasvāmī and Śivasvāmi are some other divergent forms of the name. The *Bhāgavata* describes him additionally as *arindama*, `destroyer of enemies'. *Vide ibid.*, p. 42, fn. 92.

246. *Kuntala iti, Kuntala-vishaye jātātvāt tat-samā*khyaḥ, *Kāmasūtra* with Yaśodhara's Jayamaṅgalā gloss, Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 29, Varanasi, 1929, p. 131.

247. In his *Harsha-charita.*

248. In his *Kuvalaya-mālā.*

249. In his *Rāma-charita.* For the original citations from the texts mentioned in this and the preceding two notes, see V.V. Mirashi, *Studies in Indology,* I, pp. 83-87; *HISWK,* pp. 179-80.

250. *Eso kai-ṇāmaṁkia-gāhā-paḍibaḍḍhi-āmoo,*
Satta-sao samatto Sālāhaṇa-virāio Koso.
This colophon is met with in a few of the manuscripts of the text. *Vide* V.V. Mirashi, *Studies in Indology,* I, p. 85. The colophons of the fifth and sixth centuries also must have contained the same nomenclature as found in the Sanskrit rendering (*chhāyā)* of these stanzas. See *ibid.*

251. *Ibid.* An ancient manuscript preserved in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune (No. 386 of 1887-89), cites the title of the text as *Gāthākosha. Vide ibid.*, pp. 85-86, fns. 1 and 2.

252. *Ibid.*, p. 86 and fn. 2; *HISWK,* p. [179] for the original stanza.

253. Schoff amends it to 'Sandares' and equates him with Sundara Sātakarṇi of the Purāṇas. However, the evidence of the *Periplus* appears to indicate that the correct form of the name was Sunandana as given in the *Bhāgavata.* That sometimes spellings found even in a single manuscript are correct and preferable to those met with in all the rest is a common knowledge, and this must have been one such case. And as such there is no need for the emendation of the reading in the *Periplus.*

254. *CAI,* p. 305, para 52.

255. *ZDMG,* 1902, p. 659.

256. *BMC, AWK,* p. 28, fn. 2.

257. *Vide* the last two notes. Curiously enough, while in the `Purāṇic list of Andhra King's *(op.cit.,* p. lxvi) Rapson mentions Meghasvāti as the ninth ruler and gives Saṅgha as its variant, in fn. 2 at p. 28, he gives Saṅgha as no. 9 and Meghasvāti as no. 16, evidently due to inadvertence. This ascription is followed by some later writers on Sātavāhana coinage including I.K. Sarma (*Coinage of the Sātavāhana Empire,* p. 131). This coin has a horse standing left on the obverse, while the reverse device is uncertain.

258. This coin has on the obverse a humped bull walking to right, in its front two *svastikas* and on the reverse a Caduceus and Ujjain symbol with a cresent over one of its orbs.

259. *Excavations at Bhokardan,* ed. S.B. Deo, p. 22, Pl. XV.4.

260. Gotamīputra and Gomatīputra are the variants of the name noticed by Pargiter (*DKA,* p. 42, fn. 93), while Rapson (*BMC, AWK,* p. lxvii) gives Yantramati doubtfully as the reading of the name in the *Brahmāṇḍa.*

261. *Vide DKA,* p. 42, fn. 8.

262. This is as per the extant data; but they are quite meagre and in some cases quite doubtful and damaged (Nāṇeghāṭ larger inscription) and not much can be built up on this highly fragile foundation.

263. *Vide* his inscriptions at Nāsik and Kārle.

264. *SI*, I, p. 205, line 9.

265. *DKA*, p. 42, line 26; fn. 94 does not record any important variation.

266. *BMC, AWK*, p. lxvii. However, this is unknown to not only Pargiter but also to R.G. Bhandarkar. *Vide EHD*, p. 45. But it must be remembered that the latter takes no note of the *Brahmāṇḍa* text.

267. *SI*, I, p. 201, line 7.

268. This date-bracket has been arrived at by taking into consideration the contemporaneity of Gautamīputra Sātakaraṇi with Kshaharāta Nahapāna who is referred to as Mambarus or Nambanus by the anonymous text *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* composed in about AD 60-70 and Nahapāna's priority to the Kārdamaka king Chashṭana, the initiator of the Śaka era. For a detailed discussion of the evidence, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Saka Era'', *IJHS*, XXXI, pp. 67-88.

If, however, he ruled for thirty-four years as averred by the *Brahamāṇḍa*, his reign may be dated 60-93 AD.

269. Actually *Pulomā vai* of the reconstituted text stands for Pulomāvi. Variants of this name and its real meaning have been discussed above in connection with the original home of the dynasty.

270. Literally it (*ashṭāviṁśaḥ sutas=tasya)* would mean 'his twenty-eighth son' which is simply ridiculous. Reference to him is dropped in the *V*āyu and *Brahmaṇḍa* lists.

271. *SI*, I, p. 201, line 7.

272. For the variants of the last two of these names, *vide infra*.

273. Shobhana Gokhale, *Kānherī Inscriptions*, Deccan College, Pune, 1991, p. 62, right column.

274. *DKA*, p. 42, line 28. Only because this is found in a single manuscript, it has been given in square parentheses. And at p. 36 the name is inserted, again within parentheses, as no. 24a only because its full-fledged acceptance would raise the number of Andhra kings to thirty-one whereas most Purāṇas aver that their number was thirty which is treated as a sanctified fact.

275. For the latest list of his coins, *vide* Mala Datta, *op.cit.*, pp. 301-7.

276. *SI*, I, p. 178, line 12.

277. Some of the variants of the name found in *Matsya* manuscripts include Śivaśvā, Sivasī, and Śirogrīva in so far as the first component is concerned. As for the second, some of the manuscripts read Sulomā. The readings sometimes are *Pulomāt tu* or *Sulomāt tu* which have been taken to be in ablative singular with disastrous results. *Vide DKA*, p. 42, fns. 1-2. The *e*Vā manuscript of *Vāyu* gives him only a four-year reign. *Vide ibid.*,

p. 42, fn. 3. In one *Matsya* manuscript (*b*Mt of Pargiter) *saptaiva* is replaced by *samaiva* which is totally meaningless but shows that some years (*samā)* were intended to be but not mentioned.

278. For a full discussion of the Purāṇic data on the issue together with numismatic and epigraphic corroborative evidence, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Vāsishṭhīputra Śivaśrī Puḷumāvi'' *Raṅgavallī: Recent Researches in Indology* (S.R. Rao Felicitation Volume), eds. A.V.N. Murthy and B.K. Gururaja Rao), Sundeep Prakashan, Delhi, 1983, pp. 151-62.

279. This is inferred from his mention following them and on the assumption that the succession among brothers must have been in order of seniority.

280. A.V. Narasimha Murthy and H.R. Raghunatha Bhat, ''Banavāsī Inscription of Siva Siri Puḷumāvi'', *Studies in Indian Epigraphy (JESI)*, I, pp. 34-39. In *HISWK*, pp. 59-62, also it is published though erroneously ascribed to Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi.

281. I.K. Sarma and J. Varaprasada Rao, *Early Brāhmī Inscriptions from Samati*, p. 76.

282. A.F.R. Hoernle in the *Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1903, pp. 116-17; E.J. Rapson, *JRAS*, 1903, p. 305; M.F.C. Martin, ''Observations on Some Andhra Coins'', *Numismatic Supplement* of *JSAB*, 1934, p. 61.

283. V.V. Mirashi, ''A New Hoard of Sātavāhana Coins from Tarhāla (Akola District)'', *JNSI*, II, pp. 88-89; *Studies in Indology*, III, Nagpur University, 1961, pp. 40-41.

284. V.V. Mirashi, ''Wāṭegāon Hoard of Sātavāhana Coins'', *JNSI*, XXXIV, p. 208.

285. Mala Datta, *op.cit.*, pp. 308-9 for the latest list.

286. R. Nagaswamy, ''A Bilingual Coin of Siva Siri Pulumavi'', *A.P. Journal of Archaeology*, I, No. 2, pp. 105-13; V.V. Krishna Sastry, *The Proto and Early Historical Cultures of Andhra Pradesh*, A.P. Govt. Archaeological Series, No. 58, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, 1983, p. 204, p. 102.

287. Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Some Sātavāhana Silver Portrait Coins'', *Journal of the Academy of Indian Numismatics and Sigillography*, III, pp. 7-9, p. 1.2.

288. Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Koṇḍāpur : A Sātavāhana Silver Coin Mint'', *SSIC*, III, pp. 81-85.

289. ''The Identity of the Sātavāhana King Śiva Śri Puḷumāvi,'' *JNSI*, XXXI, pp. 151-54.

290. ''A New Hoard of Sātavāhana Coins from Tarhāḷā (Akolā District)'', *ibid.*, II, pp. 88-89; *Studies in Indology*, III, pp. 40-41.

291. This conclusion has met with approval in scholarly quarters which have termed it 'convincing', *vide* Amiteshwar Jha and Dilip Rajgor, *Studies in the Coinage of the Western Kṣatrapas*, Indian Institute of Research in Numismatic Studies, Anjaneri, 1994, p.6.

292. This is the spelling met in many manuscripts of the *Matsya*, in the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Bhāgavata (vide BMC, AWK*, p. lxvii) and in eVā manuscript of the *Vāyu* (*DKA*, p. 42, fn. 5). A few other erroneous variants of the first part of the king's name include Śivaskandhra, Śivasvanda', Śivasunda and Śiraskandha. *Vide ibid.* For the second component we have the variations Sātikarṇa, Śalaiḥkarṇika and Samakarṇi, and the rather strange Nṛipaskanda which, of course, is the actual form of the first part. That he was a *nṛipa* (king) goes without saying. For these forms, *vide ibid.*, fn. 6.

293. It is not met with in the legends of his coins except only a doubtful case from Bhokardan excavations which was doubtfully assigned to Śivaśrī Sātakarṇi (*Excavations at Bhokardan*, pp. 23-24) by the present author who now feels with Mala Datta (*op.cit.*, p. 310) that it may perhaps have been issued by Śivaskanda Sātakarṇi. However, as the preservation of the coin is quite indifferent, it is not possible to be sure on this point.

294. For the latest list, *vide ibid.*, pp. 309-12.

295. *DKA*, p. 42, line. 30.

296. *Ibid.*, p. 42, fn. 7.

297. *Ibid.*

297a. For his silver portrait coins, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''A New Variety of Skanda Satakarni's Silver Coins'', *NS, I*, pp. 53-57.

298. *HISWK*, pp. 40-41, for an instance.

299. In some manuscripts of the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu*, the words *Yajña* and *srī* are found isolated into *Yajñaḥ śrīḥ*. It may also indicate the otherwise well-established fact that Yajña alone was the king's name and that *śrī* was affixed to it only as an honorific. Some *Vāyu* manuscripts supply the variant yajuśrī, while the *Bhāgavata* sometimes records the variants Yajñasāra and Yajñaśīla and a *Vishṇu* manuscript the curious Suṅgaśrī. *Vide DKA*, p. 42 and fns. 10 and 12.

300. This is the reading of the *Matsys* one of whose manuscripts also gives the reading Sātakarṇin. *Vide ibid.*, fn. 11.

301. *Vāyu* whose reading it is also gives in a manuscript the strange reading Sāmakarni which has resulted from the inadvertent substitution of *m* for the correct *t*. See *ibid.*, p. 42 and fn. 13 at p. 43.

302. Two other instaṇces of the employment of this word are furnished by the mention of Sātakarṇi, Kṛishṇa's son, where it precedes the name, and of Śiva where it follows the personal name as in the present case.

303. *Nava-vimśati* or *nava-vimśat* is the common expression in the *Matsya*. *Vide ibid.*, p. 42 (text) and fn. 8.

304. *Ekonavimśatiṁ* is the normal reading; but some *Vāyu* manuscripts give *ekonatrimśataṁ* and it is found corrupted into *trikonatrimśataṁ* in a *Vāyu* manuscript. *Vide ibid.*, p. 42 (text) and fn. 9. As stated above, some *Matsya* manuscripts refer to Yajña Sātakarṇi as ruling in his ninth year.

305. *HISWK*, Chinā inscription, p. 77.

306. *Ibid.*, inscription nos. 26-29 (Nāsik, Kānherī [two records] and Chinā).

307. This is true of all his coins in different metals except a series mostly in potin where he is referred to only by his personal name, in Prakrit, viz. Yaña Sātakaṇi.

308. The *e*Vā manuscript of the Vāyu reads *dvijaḥ yaśu*, a *Vishṇu* manuscript had Dviyajna and a *Bhāgavata* manuscript provides the alternative form Vinaya instead of Vijaya which

is the commonest and correct reading of the royal name. The *Bhāgavata* describes him as *tat-sutaḥ*, 'his (Yajña's) son', which is not possible in view of the employment of the common metronymic Gautamīputra to both Yajña and Vijaya, showing that they were related as uterine brothers. *Tasmād* met with before the king's name should accordingly be taken to be synonymous with *tataḥ* and to mean `thereafter'. Three manuscripts read *samā daśa* instead of the common *samā nṛipaḥ;* but it is simply ridiculous as they also contain the expression *shaḍ=eva* (six only) at the beginning of the hemistich, and a six-and ten-year rule for the same king in the same stanza is just impossible. *Vide ibid.*, p. 43, line 31 and fns. 14-17.

309. H. Sarkar, ''Nāgārjunakoṇḍa Prakrit Inscription of Gautamīputra Vijaya Sātakarni, Year 6'', *EI*, XXXVI, pp. 273-74.

310. This and allied forms of the name are met with in the *Matsya, Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata.* Two *Matsya* manuscripts give Vaṇḍaśrī and one Chandratī, the *Vishṇu* commonly has Chandraśrī, while the *Bhāgavata* generally has *vijña* instead of the honorific *śrī*, the variants found in some other manuscripts being *vīja* and vīrya. One *Bhāgavata* manuscript reads the name as Chandrashī. For Sātakarṇi the *Matsya* manuscripts contain generally the form Śāntikarṇa and a few of its manuscripts also Śamakarṇi. See *ibid.*, p. 43, fns. 19-20.

311. This is the reading of the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa.* The latter, however, separates the honorific *śrī* and joins it to the following Sātakarṇi. *Vide ibid.*, fn. 22.

312. *Ibid.*, p.43, left column, line 34.

313. *Ibid.*, p. 43, right column, line 34. Fn. 23, which records variants, adds precious little.

314. H. Krishna Sastry, ''The Kodavali Rock-Inscription of Chaṇḍasāti: The Second Year of Reign'', *EI*, XVIII, pp. 316-19.

315. *Ibid.*, p. 318, line 3. He cites Sten Konow's reading which was 10 (+) 3 (?).

316. *HISWK*, p.86.

317. *Vide* for discussion, Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''Vāsishṭhīputra Vijaya Sātakarṇi'', *ND*, XVII, pp. 29-36.

318. In the Purāṇas the form Pulomāvi is used while in inscriptions and coin-legends we have Puḷumāvi. For Purāṇic variants, see *DKA*, p. 43, fn. 24. The variants have already been noticed in connection with the name Pulumāvi and its significance for deciding their original kingdom.

319. The expression *anyas=teshāṁ* adopted by Pargiter and its variants met with in the manuscripts are actually intended for *antyas=teshāṁ* as pointed out by him. *Vide ibid.*, fn. 26.

320. *Ibid.*, p. 43, line 34 and fn. 25. The king's name has been spelt variously, many of which have been noticed above while discussing the question of the dynasty's original territory.

321. In the Vāsana or Haḷe-Vāsana inscription to be referred to below.

322. ''A New Andhra Inscription of Siri-Pulumavi,'' *EI*, XIV, pp. 153-55. For the suggested identification, *vide* p. 154.

323. *Ibid.*, p. 155, line 1. Similar expressions mentioning the dynasty in genitive plural and the reigning (or issuing) king as belonging to it are encountered in slightly later inscriptions of the Deccanese ruling families like the Pallavas, Ikshvākus, Kadambas, Vākāṭakas, etc.

324. For the inscription, see M.J. Sharma, "Vāsana Inscription of Vāsiṭhiputa Siri Puḷumāvi", *ibid.*, XLI, pp. 154-58. The expression under reference is met with in line 2 (p.158) and reads *de [vā] yatana-vāsisa mahādevasa Chaḍasivasa.* The expression seems to refer to king Chaṇḍaśiva as having become one with god Mahādeva (i.e. Śiva) whose devotee he appears to have been.

325. V.V. Mirashi, *Studies in Indology,* III p. 45.

326. For their coins, *vide ibid.*, pp. 43-45; for a discussion on the significance of the find of these coins, *vide EHD:PP,* pp. 38-45.

327. For the constituted text, *vide DKA*, p. 45, left column, lines 1-4: *Andhrāṇāṁ saṁsthite rājye teshāṁ bhrity-ānvayā nripāh,*

Sapt-aiv-Āndhrā bhavishyanti daś-Ābhīrās=tathā nṛipāh.

For some of the variants, *vide ibid.*, fns. 1-4, 6-9.

328. The original hemistich as constituted by Pargiter runs as *sapt-Ābhīrā Andhra-bhṛityā. Vide ibid.*, p. 45, right column, line 1, and fn. 5 on the same page for some meaningless variants.

329. V.V. Mirashi, *Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era, CII*, IV, Government Epigraphist for India, Ootacamund, 1955, p. 3.

330. For a fuller discussion of Sātarāhana history, *wide* are *SWKHF*, Part I.

2

Simuka was the Son of Śātakarṇi*

P.V. PARABRAHMA SASTRY

About fifteen years back I published some pre-Sātavāhana and Sātavāhana coins found at Koṭaliṅgāla,[1] a village situated on the right bank of the river Godāvarī in Karīmnagar district, Andhra Pradesh. Subsequently Raja Reddy and Suryanarayana Reddy also published several coins form the same place.[2] The site was excavated by the Department of Archaeology and Museums, Andhra Pradesh, and a brief description of their finds was given in their *Annual Reports* for the years 1981-82 and 1983-84 and few seminar papers presented by the concerned officers. The excavators identified six layers, the depth of the lowermost layer varying between 2.15 metres and 1.7 metres in many trenches and the surface being almost even; differences in contours are not recorded. The antiquities unearthed in the stratified layers included the ceramic wares Black and Red, Black polished, Red slipped and and Chocolate or tanned wares, coins and beads (glass, terracotta and faience). Basing on these finds the upper date of the site is fixed to be approximately the post-Maurya period or the closing part of the third century BC. On the basis of the conspicuous absence of the coins of the later Sātavāhanas after Puḷumāvi I, it is assumed that the site lost its importance after the first century of the Christian era.

This is one of the early historical sites where we get a large number of coins representing, besides the punch-marked and uninscribed coins, at least twelve rulers. About 140 coins in stratified layers and more than a thousand coins on the surface are found at the site. Layer-wise occurrence of the coins in the excavation is as follows:

1.	Punch-marked coins	4th layer and above
2.	Uninscribed coins	in all layers

---

*This is the condensed form of this writer's book *Sātavāhana Epoch – A New Light.*

3.	Coins of Gobhada	6, 3, and 1
4.	Coins of Siri Kaṁvāya	5 and 3
5.	Coins of Samagopa	in all layers
6.	Coins of Siri Nārana	5, 2 and 1
7.	Coins of Siri Sātavāhana	5 to 1
8.	Coins of Siri Sātakaṇi	5 to 1
9.	Coins of Chhimuka Sātavāhana	3, 2 and 1
10.	Coins of Siri Pulumāvi	1 and surface
11.	Coins of Mahātalavara I	5 and surface
12.	Coins of Mahātalavara II	surface
13.	Coins of Mahāsenāpati Sagamāna	surface
14.	Coins of Siri Vāya	surface

Coins of Siri Vaya (no. 14), although few, six or seven in number, exhibit all early features similar to those of Siri Kaṁvāya (no. 4). Hence he is treated as an early member.

The occurrence of the coin series in stratified layers as shown above, sheds new light on the chronology of the early rulers of the region, particularly the early Sātavāhanas. As the number of the coins of Siri Kaṁvāya is only two recorded in the excavations and they contain the little evolved symbols, he is placed after Gobhada and before Samagopa. It is strikingly noticeable that Chhimuka's coins occur only in the upper layers 3, 2 and 1, whereas the coins of Sātavāhana and Sātakarṇi are found in layers 5 and above which fact clearly indicates that Simuka flourished later than Sātavāhana and even Sātakarni. Let us examine whether this stratigraphical sequence holds good if we take into consideration the other evidences also.

While publishing the coins of Chhimuka Sātavāhana found on the surface I have treated those coins to be earlier than those of Sātavāhana and Sātakarṇi although they exhibit features of later period. Being led away by the unanimous Purāṇa statements, as all scholars do, I too took Simuka to be earlier than the other two kings. Now the archaeological evidence makes me correct my earlier opinion. In order to get rid of this difficulty of placing Simuka as late as 40-30 BC, I.K. Sarma suggested that this Chhimuka might have been another member besides the founder of the family.[3] But we lack evidence for so assuming. It can be said for certain that there was only one Chhimuka or Simuka who flourished after c. 30 BC. The coins bearing the legend *Raño Chhimuka Sātavāhanasa* are of that period. Instead of disturbing Chhimuka's period from c. 30 BC on the evidence of the stratigraphical sequence Sātakarṇi can be safely assigned to an earlier period than Simuka, or Chhimuka of the coins.

Coin symbolism and palaeography of the legend also support this view. The composite *nandipada* symbol appears continuously as the main reverse symbol on the coins of Siri Kaṁvāya, Siri Vāya, Samagopa and Siri Sātavāhana (on some coins). Later the last ruler reduced it as a secondary symbol on the obverse and Sātakarṇi continued it. Even this modified form of the *nandipāda* was totally removed by Chhimuka Sātavāhana who is identifiable with Simuka of the Nāṇeghāṭ label inscription.

Although Siri Sātavāhana adopted on some of his coins that composite *nandipada* symbol, he replaced it by composite Ujjain symbol on the reverse which was continued by Sātakarṇi and Chhimuka. The letters *Śa* and *ka* on the coins of Chhimuka appear to be quite late when compared with those on the coins of Sātakarṇi.

If we consider the relievo figures and labels in the Nāṇeghāṭ cave, there is absolutely nothing which prevents us in taking Raño Simuka Sātavāhana of the first image as the son and successor of Sātakarṇi and Nāganikā. As the founder member of the family he need not be shown in the first place. It is only because he was the ruling king, Simuka was shown in the first place. In fact, he was not the founder member of the family, because it is now an established fact that Siri Sātavāhana was the founder member of the family. As Sātakarṇi was no more alive at the time when the relievo figures were carved out and as Nāganikā was a widow, this royal couple was not shown first. Simuka being the ruling king at that time and likely to have returned victorious after his historical feat of slaying Kāṇva Suśarman, he was given the first place among the figures. In the larger inscription also D.C. Sircar's restoration as *Raño Simuka Sātavāhanasa sunhāya* is to be corrected as *Raño Simuka Sātavāhanasa mātuya*. Simuka was the intended *śūra, vīra, apratihata-chakra* and *Dakshiṇāpatha-pati*. Those were the glorifying records with figures of both himself who could wield unopposed authority not only in the Deccan but also in the north and his deceased father Sātakarṇi who acquired a great kingdom and performed the prestigious sacrifices Aśvamedha and Rājasūya for the first time in the Deccan. Simuka commemorated these events by causing the images of himself, his parents and brothers to be carved out with labels at the instance of his mother Nāganikā.

Lastly, the Purāṇas are not at all against this new interpretation. The narration of those compilations is in relation to the Magadha throne. Accordingly, they give the account of the Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas in continuity and then after Kāṇva Suśarman, they give the account of Simuka and his descendants. These compilers need not consider his father Sātakarṇi and grandfather Sātavāhana in whose period Magadha was already under the Kāṇvas and some Śuṅgas. However, the Purāṇas are not altogether ignorant about Simuka's parentage. The following lines in the *Kaliyugarāja-vṛittānta* reveal that Simuka was the son of Sātakarṇi.

Simukas-Sātakarṇis=tu yam-āhur=balinaṁ janāḥ l
bhokshyaty=Andhra-mahīṁ rājā trayastriṁśati-vatsarān ll
Kṛishṇaś=śrī-Śātakarṇis=tu bhrātā chāsya mahāyaśaḥ l
ashṭādaśa samā rājā Kaṇvā(Kṇn)khyena bhavishyati ll
Mallaś=śri-Śātakarṇis=tu tato bhāvī samā daśa

Here Simuka, Kṛishṇa and Malla are described as Sātakarṇis, which means they were the sons and grandson of Sātakarṇi. On the basis of the Nāṇeghāṭ labels we can take Simuka as his son. He had both the suffixes Sātavāhana as seen in the label inscription and on coins and Sātakarṇi as seen in the above-quoted lines of the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛittānta.*

The authenticity of the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛittānta* is undoubtedly questionable because of its late origin and interpolations in it. However, the above lines are quoted by C.R. Krishnamachariar in his *History of Sanskrit Literature,* which is published in 1937. At this time scholars were not entertaining any doubt about Simuka's parentage and did not consider the above-cited lines to be of historical value, because they unanimously accepted the Purāṇas which mention him to have founded the Sātavāhana family after slaying the Kāṇva king Suśarman. It is only after the discovery of the coins of the early Sātavāhanas along with still earlier rulers at Koṭilingāla in 1978 that we have to face the serious doubt about Simuka's place in the chronological sequence as furnished by the stratigraphy as well as coin symbolism, etc. which clearly indicate a later place for him. Then arose the need to re-examine the epigraphic and Purāṇa evidences. In the context the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛittānta*, although very late in origin, is also to be considered. The said lines cannot be the interpolations later than 1937, the year of publication of the work, when there was no difference of opinion regarding Simuka's place in the Sātavāhana line. Therefore it is not unreasonable to utilize those lines of *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛittānta* which had some traditional source originally and certainly contain some truth which is now corroborated by archaeological and numismatic evidence. The other Purāṇa statements are not at all against our view as they narrate the political succession of Magadha throne as stated above.

The Purāṇas do not vitiate our new theory, and, on the other hand, it is very specific in the *Kaliyuga-rāja-vṛittānta* that Simuka was a descendant of Sātakarṇi. The missing label might be that of Kṛishṇa who was Sātakarṇi's second son and prince designate.

Thus, to conclude, stratigraphy, numismatics, epigraphy and lastly the Purāṇas, all reveal that Simuka succeeded his father Sātakarṇi, who was the son of Sātavāhana.

Now, this assumption solves two important problems namely, Sātakarṇi-Khāravela synchronism and Simuka-Kāṇva Suśarman synchronism. According to the present

surmise, Sātakarṇi's date would be in the middle of the first century BC, that is *c.* 60 BC to *c.* 30 BC. By reckoning the post-Maurya period from *c.* 187 BC, the Śuṅgas ruled for 112 years and the Kāṇvas for 45 years and thus addding 157 years we arrive at 30 BC as the date of Simuka's slaying the last Kāṇva king Suśarman. Taking this date as the last date of Sātakarṇi's career, his initial date would be c. 60 BC and his predecessor Siri Sātavāhana's period would be between c. 80 BC and 60 BC. We have to count back from 80 BC the regnal periods of Gobhada about 25 years, Siri Kaṁvāya about 15 years, Vāyasiri about 10 years and Samagopa bout 40 years, total about 90 years. Leaving some period for the issurers of the uninscribed coins we get c. 187 BC, the date of the extinction of the Mauryas. Thus c. 80 BC would be the initial date of the independent rule of Siri Sātavāhana. Khāravela according to his Hathigumphā inscription ruled after 300 years of a certain Nanda king. The Nanda rule is believed to have come to an end in the middle of the fourth century BC and hence Khāravela's period might have been in the middle of the first century BC. This exactly coincides with the regnal period of Sātakarṇi. Palaeography of the Hathigumphā and Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions with little disparity in time and regional variations can also be assigned to the same period, instead of assigning those records to some time after the Christ.

We have two initial dates for the Sātavāhana epoch which are correct in their own way.

1. About 80 BC when Siri Sātavāhana founded his independent kingdom in the Deccan. This took place after the regnal periods of some issuers of the uninscribed coins, Gobhada (25 years), Siri Kaṁvāya (15 years), Vāyasiri (10 years) and Samagopa (40 years), all taken approximately basing on their coin quantity, after the fall of the Maurya authority in *c.* 187 BC. The total regnal period of the said four rulers and of the issuers of at least few uninscribed coins must have been more than a hundred years. Then Siri Sātavāhana founded the independent Sātavāhana kingdom in about 80 BC.
2. Simuka assassinated the last Kāṇva king Suśarman in about 30 BC. The compilers of the Purāṇa narrated that account in relation to the Magadha throne, that means, up to the end of Suśarman, they did not consider the father and forefather of Simuka, who were but contemporaries of the Kāṇva and Suṅga rulers. Their aim was to give the account of the Magadha throne in continuity without describing Simuka's father and forefathers.

To conclude the order of succession.

Samagopa was followed by Siri Sātavāhana, the latter by his son Sātakarṇi, who was the contemporary of Khāravela. Simuka was the son and successor of this Sātakarṇi. Thus stratigiaphy, numismatics, epigraphy and the Purāṇas, all support the theory that Simuka was the son of Sātakarṇi.

POSTSCRIPT

The issue regarding Sātakarṇi-Simuka relationship can be also viewed from a different angle. Of the two early Sātakarṇis mentioned in the Puŕaṇas, who performed the sacrifices Aśvamedha, Rājasūya, etc., as we assume from the Nāṇeghāṭ inscription? Till now scholars are of the opinion that either Malla Sātakarṇi, son of Kṛishṇa, with 10 years reign or another Sātakarṇi after Pūrṇotsaṅga, with 56 years of rule, must have been the former of those sacrifices. What extraordinary achievements can be attributed to either of the two Sātakarṇis which make him entitled for performing those prestigious sacrifices? They were in those days performed by such a king who established sovereignty for the family or acquired an empire (*chakravarti-kshetra*). Pallava Śivaskandavarman after expanding his kingdom to western lower Deccan, whence he issued the Hirahaḍagalli Plates, is stated in it for the first time to have performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice.[6] Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman did so after acquiring a vast kingdom.[7] So also Chālukya Pulakeśin I observed Aśvamedha after establishing sovereign authority in the Bādāmī region.[8] In the case of Malla Sātakarṇi or the later Sātakarṇi it is not known what extraordinary achievement can be attributed to him which may entitle him for performing the great sacrifices proclaiming their political supremacy.[9] We are absolutely in dark in this regard. On the other hand, the *Vāyupurāṇa* totally skips the mention of Malla Sātakarṇi but mentions only one Sātakarṇi with a reign of 56 years. However, D.C. Sircar, perhaps thinking that his contemporaneity with Khāravela, the Kaliṅga invader, would be difficult in his chronological scheme, considers Malla Sātakarṇi, that is Kṛishṇa's son with a reign of 10 years, and almost ignores the existence of the later Sātakarni. *(The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp.198-99). He says that Sātakarṇi, i.e. Malla Sātakarṇi performed the sacrifices to commemorate the recently acquired sovereignty of the Sātavāhana family. Even then it was more than 40 years after the acquisiton of sovereignty by Simuka's assassination of Kāṇva Suśarman. The very purpose of performing those great sacrifices in those days was a kind of proclamation of sovereignty soon after its acquisition, as in the case of Puśyamitra Śuṅga earlier. A late performance of those prestigious sacrifices after two generations by a king in the third generation carries hardly any significance. If the sacrifices are to be attributed to the other Sātakarṇi of a reign of 56 years, it would be still later both for their significance as well as Khāravela sequence. If Malla Sātakarṇi were the real performer of such prestigious sacrifices, the *Vāyupurāṇa* would not have omitted his name.

In all appropriateness, the performance of the great sacrifices is to be attributed to Simuka himself who by slaying Kāṇva Suśarman established sovereignity for the Sātavāhana family, as the Purāṇas unanimously narrate. According to my new suggestion, as Śimuka's parents king Sātakarṇi I and queen Nāganikā were still alive when he got those sacrifices performed by the old Royal couple at whose instance and with whose good wishes he achieved the political sovereignty for the family.

Thus the Nāṇeghāt inscription squarely fits in with my assumption that Simuka was the son of Sātakarṇi who became a sovereign king in the closing part of his career. Hence most of his descendants are called as Sātakarṇi by surname.

The Purāṇas did not mention the two early kings because they were considered to be subordinate rulers under the imperial throne of Magadha, though nominally. That is the very reason, why Sātakarṇi deputed his son Simuka to lead the Kāṇva armies as commander, probably in their struggle against the last scions of the Śuṅgas who were active at Vidiśā. Simuka took this opportunity in eradicating both the Śuṅgas as well as his master Kāṇva Suśarman.

In this connection I once again request the scholars to reconsider the existence of the pre-Sātavāhana coins bearing the legends Gobhada, Kaṁvāya (Kaṇvāya), Samagopa (Svāmigopa) and Siri Narana (i.e. Śrī Narāyaṇa), the name of the third Kāṇva king. The fifth Śuṅga king is also named as Andhraka, as Pargiter quoted from one manuscript of a Purāṇa, and he is stated to have been the son and successor of the fourth king Vasumitra. So Andhraka might have been a son of one Andhra princess or himself acted as viceroy in Andhra under his father. Taking together all these numismatic points, we are led to believe that the Śuṅgas and Kāṇvas exercised some nominal authority over the Andhra rulers. The need for performing the prestigious sacrifices like Rājasūya and Aśvamedha along with some other ones for Sātakarṇi I arose only to indicate or rather proclaim his sovereignty acquired by eradicating the erstwhile overlords. Simuka's father Sātakarṇi I being very aged at the time, the former conducted the coup and hence was considered in the Purāṇas as the first sovereign king of the Andhras.

To conclude, the two Sātakarṇis mentioned in the Purāṇas, 1. Malla Sātakarṇi and 2. the later Sātakarṇi with 56 years' rule cannot be convincingly connected with the two epigraphically well-known events, namely the perrforming of the great sacrifices and Khāravela's synchronism. So we have to search for another Sātakarṇi. The stratified discovery and symbolism of the coins at Koṭaliṅgāla reveal the existence of another Sātakarṇi who can be definitely assigned to an earlier period than that of chhimuka. This Sātakarṇi fits well in the said two epigraphical events. His son was Simuka who possessed the surname Sātakarṇi also along with the name of Sātavāhana, the founder member of the family.

The fact that Simuka was a *bhṛitya* or *sāmanta* ruler as the Purāṇas repeatedly say is logically proved by his becoming a military commander in the service of the Kāṇva king. A sovereign king does not accept such service. In order to throw off the yoke of subordination and acquire sovereignty only Simuka had ventured to assassinate Suśarman. The performance of the great sacrifices with lavish gifts leads us to believe in the Purāṇa statements to some extent in this regard.[10]

Notes and References

1. ND, Vol. II, part I, pp. 10 ff.; *ibid*, Vol. III, part II, pp. 17 ff.; *Andhra Pradesh Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. I, pp. 133 ff.
2. Raja Reddy and P. Suryanarayana Reddy, *Kotilingala Coinage of Sātavāhanas and Other Local Rulers, A Profile*, Hyderabad, 1987; *Numismatic Studies* , Vol. 2, Articles Nos. 7 and 9.
3. I.K. Sarma, *Coinage of the Sātavāhana Empire*, Delhi, 1980, pp. 126, 132.
4. Actually *raja*-Ed.
5. C.R. Krishnamachariar, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, Madras, 1937, Intro., pp. LIV-LVI.
6. *EI*, I, pp. 5ff.
7. It is not unlikely that Mādhavavarman established sovereignity also as his father Govindavarman seems to have been a petty ruler of a small kingdom in Telaṅgānā and even as a subordinate under the rising Vākāṭakas.
8. Bādāmi Rock Inscription of Vallabheśrara (Pulakeśin I), *EI*, XXVII, pp. 4-9.
9. Aśvamedha was generally performed by the first sovereign ruler only of the family. Pulakeśin II although greater than Pulakeśin I did not perform it.
10. For a different view-point, see the preciding paper-Ed.

3

The Sātavāhanas in Literature

S.B. DEO

I

It is well known that the Sātavāhanas were the first indigenous rulers of the Deccan who carved out and organized an empire incorporating most of the parts of the present state of Maharashtra. Apart from political consolidation, it was during their regime that Buddhism and Vedic-Paurāṇic religion received a fillip, and trade—internal as well as external—flourished. Thus their regime, covering a span of three to four centuries, made a signal contribution to the political, economic, social and cultural history of the Deccan.

However, in spite of these achievements the history of the dynasty is beset with controversies with quite a range of opinions expressed regarding it. The origin, the dating, the succession sequence, the number of kings, the names of the rulers—all these have evoked different views from different scholars. However, the present essay will state objectively the data regarding this dynasty without reference to the controversies, so that as comprehensive a presentation based on literary sources as possible can be had.

The literary data regarding the Sātavāhanas can be considered under three categories, to wit, (a) Brāhmaṇical, (b) Buddhist and (c) Jaina, or to put it in literary parlance, (a) Sanskrit, (b) Pāli and (c) Ardhamāgadhī. It may be stated, however, that the literary data in the first category is both sumptuous as well as historically valuable. The rest of the categories, as will be seen later, present mostly sketchy and almost legendary data.

II

As has been made clear earlier, several aspects of the Sātavāhana history have been rather controversial. This is the case even in respect of the main Brāhmaṇical source—the

Purāṇas—available for their study. The *Vāyu*, the *Brahmāṇḍa*, the *Bhāgavata*, the *Vishṇu* and the *Matsya* are the Purāṇas which incorporate the information of the 'Andhra' dynasty which is identical with the Sātavāhanas. Apart from the inconsistent information given in these, it may also be pointed out that the precise date of these Purāṇas individually cannot be ascertained. However, it has been rightly pointed out by Pargiter that 'the versions of the *Matsya*, *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* present a remarkable similarity... . The *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata* have very much in common and their versions are generally alike...'. He further points out that both the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu* expressly state that their accounts are based upon the *Bhavishya Purāṇa*.

As if to give prophetic authenticity to the accounts, the latter are stated in future tense. Moreover, to lend sanctity and dignity to the accounts, these are supposed to have been narrated by distinguished persons, as for instance, the *Vishṇu*, which is stated to have been narrated by Parāśara to Maitreya. However, on a close scrutiny, these claims do not seem to stand. Yet one more noteworthy observation by Pargiter deserves to be mentioned here. He states that, 'there are clear indications that the Sanskṛit account as it exists in the *Matsya*, *Vāyu*, and *Brahmāṇḍa* was originally in Prākṛit, or more accurately, that it is a Sanskritized version of older Prākrit ślokas.'[2]

It is on the basis of these characteristics that the information regarding the Andhras (Sātavāhanas) has to be analysed and evaluated. Even though these Purāṇas incorporate accounts with differing time-spans,—for instance, the *Matsya* account ends more or less with the fall of the Andhras, whereas the *Vāyu*, *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata* continue it till the rise of the Guptas—, it is agreed that these can be assigned generally to the Gupta period. Hazra[3] has proposed the following chronological scheme for some of the important Purāṇas relevant for our study:

Matsya Purāṇa	–	3rd to 5th cent. AD
Brahmāṇḍa and *Vāyu*	–	3rd to 5th cent. AD
Vishṇu Purāṇa	–	3rd to 4th cent. AD
Bhāgavata Purāṇa	–	6th to 7th cent. AD (Some portions much later)

It would thus appear that the account of the Purāṇic literature for the construction of the Sātavāhana history suffers from lack of precision both in respect of the period of their compilation as well as their authenticity. For example, the dynasty is treated in full only in the *Matsya* Purāṇa, whereas the accounts in the other Purāṇas (*Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Bhāgavata* and *Vishṇu*) are not perfect. However, the maximum number of kings named is thirty, though all the Purānas do not mention all these, the minimum number of kings named being seventeen (*Brahmāṇḍa*).

The thirty names with their period of rule are as follows:

Simuka[4] (also Śiśuka; Sindhuka; Śipraka)

– `will assail the Kāṇvāyanas—and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas'

– will rule for 23 years

Kṛishṇa – younger brother of Simuka; will rule for 10 years

Sātakarṇi – will rule for 10 years

Pūrṇotsaṅga – will be king for 18 years

Skandhastambhi – 18 years

Sātakaraṇi – 56 years

Lambodara – son of Sātakarṇi, for 18 years

Āpīlaka – son of Lambodara, for 12 years

Meghasvātī – for 18 years

Svatī – for 18 years

Skandasvāti – for 7 years

Mṛigendra Svātikarṇa – for 3 years

Kuntala Svātikarṇa – for 8 years

Svātikarṇa – for 1 year

Pulomāvi – for 36 years

Arishṭakarṇa – for 25 years

Hāla – for 5 years

Mantalaka – for 5 years

Purikasheṇa – for 21 years

Sundara Sātakarṇi – for 1 year

Chakora Sātakarṇi – for 6 months

Śivasvāti – for 28 years

Gautamīputra – for 21 years

Pulomā – son of Gautamīputra – for 28 years

Śātakarṇi – for 29 years (mentioned only in one 'Vā'ms; therefore, *doubtful*)

Śivaśrī Pulomā – for 7 years

Śivaskandha Sātakarṇi – son of Śivasrī Pulomā; for 3 years (doubtful)

Yajñaśrī Sātakarṇika – for 29 years

Vijaya – for 6 years

Caṇḍaśrī Sātakarṇi – son of Vijaya; for 10 years

Pulomāvi – for 7 years

'These 30 Andhra kings will enjoy the earth for 460 years.' However, this is based on the *Matsya Purāṇa* only. According to the *Vāyu*, it comes to 411 years, and 456 according to *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Vishṇu* and *Bhavishya*.[5]

In spite of the above statements, scholars have pointed out that the name of the first king of the above line has been variously spelt as Simuka, Śiśuka, Sindhuka and Śipraka, and secondly, it has been stated that `The Andhra Simuka with his fellow tribesmen (*bhṛityāḥ*), the servants of Suśarman, will assail the Kānvāyanas and him (Suśarman), and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas' power...' (*Śuṅgānāṁ chaiva yac=chhesham*). Mookerji[6] states: ''Sir R.G. Bhandarkar concluded from this that 'when the princes of the Śuṅga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped the whole power and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns.' He therefore held that the period of 112 years, assigned in the Purāṇas to the rule of the Śuṅga dynasty, also included the 45 years' rule of Kāṇvas. In other words, the Kāṇvas were the *de facto* rulers during the last 45 years of the Śuṅga rule. This view has not, however, found general acceptance and is opposed to the categorical statement in the Purāṇas that the tenth Śuṅga king was killed by the first Kāṇva king. The Purāṇic statement probably indicates that even after the death of Devabhūmi and the overthrow of Śuṅga dynasty, some members or scions of the family continued to rule somewhere, such as the Vidiśā region or that the Kāṇvas, while exercising *de facto* authority, allowed some *rois faineants* of the Śuṅga dynasty after Devabhūmi to continue nominally as kings. The Andhras finally extinguished their power along with that of the Kāṇvas. We may therefore hold that the four Kāṇvāyana kings,... ruled for 45 years, i.e. from 75 BC to 30 BC.''

The dating of king Simuka has led scholars to put forth various suggesions which are related to the beginning of the dynasty, as also to the existence of more than one Simuka on the basis of the mention of other related names of the king (or kings) and the recent find of the coins whose legends spell the name[7] as Chhimuka (as at Koṭaliṅgala in Andhra Pradesh).

Whereas the end of the Sātavāhana dynasty has been dated with relative certainty, the beginning has evoked quite a range of opinions. However, broadly speaking, these resolve themselves into two major groups: (a) those who advocate early date–say, c. 3rd cent BC; and (b) those who propose a later date—say, 1st cent BC.

Sarma says: 'Chattopadhaya accepts the beginning of the rule of the Sātavāhana dynasty to the middle of the third century BC and places the Purāṇic Simuka as a restorer of the fortunes and independence of the dynasty, sometime in *circa* 30 BC. Earlier to this Simuka (note the variants of the name Śiśuka, Sindhuka, Śipraka, Chhismaka, etc.) nearly 12 kings ruled and the dynasty suffered a setback due to the

rise of the powerful Śuṅgas (184-124 BC) and later on Kāṇvas. After Simuka, 19 *(Matsya)* or 17 kings (*Vāyu*) ruled for nearly 272 years beginning from *circa* 40 BC. The Paurāṇikas were drafting these incidents after several centuries and hence some confusion arose. But the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa's* statement concluding the account of the Kāṇvas clearly echoes the revival of Sātavāhana power under Simuka, perhaps at a not too distant epoch.'[8]

Sarma himself seems to support early date and speaks of two Chhimukas – earlier and later. In support of this, he quotes the reading given by Pargiter[9] in his footnote 42 on page 35 which says: *pṛithvī punar=Āndhrān gamishyati.* The *śloka* would mean 'The Kāṇvas will rule the earth for forty-five years, then it will *again* go to the Andhras.' He, therefore, concludes,[10] ''*Vishṇu Purāṇa* names the dynasty as *Āndhrabhṛitya*, evidently meaning Andhras who were once servants. Surely so, the rulers immediately preceding the Purāṇic Simuka, remained perhaps as *bhṛitya* under the powerful Śuṅgas, after some initial successes in the warring period of the Mauryan rule in the Deccan. The unanimous Purāṇic statements that the last Kāṇvāyana ruler Suśarman was overthrown by this later Chhimuka (II) could thus have taken place sometime in *circa* 40 BC, but this can, in no way, be a point to dispute the foundation of the dynasty to the middle of 3rd century BC.'' Sarma identifies the Chhimuka of the Koṭaliṅgāla coins with the Purāṇic Simuka datable to the end of the 1st cent BC on palaeographic grounds and takes him to be a distant successor of (the first) Simuka, the founder of the dynasty. He dates the first Simuka to *circa* 230 BC and the second `Siri Chhimuka Sātavāhana (Sātakarṇi), 14th of the list', to *circa 40* BC ''who exterminated the last of the Kāṇvas.''[11] The protagonists of early date include Bhandarkar, Burgess, Vincent Smith, Rapson, Mirashi and others.

The late date protagonists include Sircar and champion the latest of this school is Ajay Mitra Shastri. Sircar[12], basing his argument on Purānic lists says: ''According to the Purāṇic lists of the `future' kings, the ten rulers of the Śuṅga dynasty, that came to power 137 years after Chandragupta Maurya's accession about 324 BC, reigned for a period of 112 years, and last Śuṅga king Devabhūti was overthrown by his *amātya* Vasudeva, the founder of the Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana dynasty; the four Kāṇva kings in all ruled for 45 years and the last of them, Suśarman, was ousted by the founder of Andhra (Sātavāhana) dynasty whose name is given as Simuka in inscriptions, but variously as Śiśuka, Śipraka, Sindhuka, etc. in the Purāṇic texts. If these traditions are to be accepted, the overthrow of the Kāṇva king Suśarman by the Andhra (Sātavāhana) Simuka may be assigned to a date 137 + 112 + 45 = 294 years after *c.* 324 BC, i.e. about 30 BC. Simuka, who reigned for twenty-three years according to the Purāṇas, may be supposed to have ruled about the third quarter of the first century BC and to have extirpated the Kāṇvas about the close of his career.''[13] In addition to this literary

evidence, the two groups of scholars also take help of palaeographical evidence, though with divergent views. Whereas the Nāṇeghāt statue records are assigned `to the middle of the 3rd cent. BC' (palaeographically) by Sarma[14] and Mirashi,[15] the same along with others from Nāsik, Sāñchī, Hathigumphā are supposed to be `later than those of the Besnagar epigraph of Heliodorus which cannot be much earlier than the end of the second century BC.'[16]

It would thus seem that the Purāṇic literary data as also the evidence of palaeography have failed to resolve the antiquity of the Sātavāhanas, especially with reference to Simuka.

There are discrepancies in the data provided by lists of the Purāṇas regarding the Andhras (i.e. Sātavāhanas). Firstly, the number of kings given in the lists of different Purāṇas varies and ranges between 17 and 30 as has been pointed out earlier; secondly, some data regarding the sequence of succession appear to be contrary to the epigraphical evidence (for example, Pūrṇotsaṅga and Skandhastambi were successors of Sātakarṇi I, according to the Purāṇic list; whereas Vediśrī was the successor of Sātakarṇi I according to Nāṇeghāṭ inscription); thirdly, the reign-span of different kings is given differently in different Purāṇas; for instance, in some cases—Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi—inscriptions and Purāṇic data do not tally: in this case total period of his reign is given as 21 years, while an inscription mentions his 24th regnal year; fourthly, the relationship between the king and his successor is mentioned only in a few cases; and lastly, some kings are known from their coins but their names are not found in the Purāṇic lists (Karṇa and Kumbha Sātakarṇi).

The Purāṇas mention the successors of the Andhras, though in a prophetic manner, using future tense. Pargiter[17] has translated the relevant portion as follows:

"When the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end, *there will be* kings belonging to the lineage of their servants (*Andhrānāṁ saṁsthite rājye teshāṁ bhṛtyānvayā nṛipāḥ saptaiv=Andhra bhavishyanti*...) as follows:

7 kings of Andhras (these are referred to as Andhrabhṛitya in *Bhavishya* and *Vishṇu Purāṇas*. These are designated as 'Śrīparvatīya andhra' –period of reign 52 years
10 Ābhīra kings – 67 years
7 Gardhabhins – 72 years
18 Śakas – 183 years
8 Yavanas – 87 years
14 Tuṣharas – 7000 years (? 500, 107, 105?)
13 Muruṇḍas – 200 years (along with low caste men, *all* of Mleccha origin)
11 Maunas – 103 years."

It is well known that the term *Andhrabhṛitya* has led some scholars, like R.G. Bhandarkar, to propose that the dynasty belonged to Andhra Pradesh.[18]

Besides the Purāṇas, there are other sources which throw some light on the Sātavāhanas. For instance, there is a reference to Nāgārjuna and his relationship with king Sātavāhana, coming from *Harshacharita* of Bāṇabhaṭṭa (7th century AD). It is stated that when Harsha was with his sister, *āchārya* Divākaramitra came there and told the king that he wanted to tell something important to him. It so happened that the Moon god in his youthful infatuation kidnapped Tārā, the wife of Bṛihaspati, and roamed around with her in the heavens. On being admonished by the gods, Chandra returned her to Bṛihaspati. But even after this, Chandra was enamoured of her. Once seeing his own reflection in the waters of the ocean, he remembered the face of Tārā, became excited, and started weeping. His tears were received by shells and turned into exquisite pearls. These were acquired by Vāsuki Nāga in the nether world who prepared an *ekāvali* out of these and named it *mandākinī*. The necklace became endowed with the power of repelling poison removing all troubles. As such, Vāsuki used to wear it always. It so happened that the Nāgas took *āchārya* Nāgārjuna to *pātāla* (nether world) where he acquired it from Vāsuki. Nāgārjuna, having come out of *pātāla*, presented the pearl necklace to his friend, the king bearing the name Sātavāhan. This king was the lord of the three oceans (*trisamudrādhipati*). Divākamitra further told king Harsha that the necklace came in his possesion through succession of pupils *(śishyaparamparā,)* and since it had special powers he was offering it to the king as it would protect him from poison. Harsha accepted the divine necklace. (For details, see V.S. Agrawala, [1964] Harshacharita—*Eka Sāṁskritika Adhyayana* [Hindi], pp. 201-3).

It is obvious that the story seems to emphasise the friendly relationship between Nāgārjuna and king Sātavāhana. The former, it is believed, had enlightened the king. As for the identification of the king, it may be mentioned that the epithet *trisamudrādhipati* immediately recalls *tisamudatoyapītavāhana* occurring in the Nāsik Cave Inscription of Vāsishthīputra Puḷumāvi (year 19), line 3 (Lüders List No. 1123; Mirashi [1981], pp. 41 ff.

There is yet one more piece of information about the Sātavāhanas in the *Harshacharita*. He refers to the creation or compilation of a *Kośa* of *subhāshitas* by Sātavāhana which was practically an inexhaustible treasure of pure jewels' Though D.R. Bhandarkar proposed that this *Kosha* was different from the *Gāthāsaptaśatī* of king Hala (17th king of the Andhra lineage), Mirashi has convincingly identified it with the *Gāthāsaptaśatī*. The literary charm of the work compiled by Hāla has been praised by the famous Uddyotanasūri (8th cent AD) in his well-known work *Kuvalayamālā*.

The *Harshacharita* of Bāṇa provides some additional data which may be related to

the Sātavāhanas. In his preamble, Bāṇa has refered to Āḍhyarāja and his literary compositions termed as *utsāha*. Various identifications of this Āḍhyarāja have been proposed. According to some, he was a poet who composed in Prākṛit; some identify him with king Harsha; and some have equated him with king Sātavāhana. A story goes that Guṇāḍhya composed the *Bṛihatkathā* in seven lakh verses and presented the work in the court of king Sātavāhana. The king, however, did not show any interest at which Guṇāḍhya destroyed six lakh *ślokas*. The remaining one lakh were preserved by king Sātavāhana. This story seems to have gained currency even in the period of Bāṇa (V.S., Agrawala, 1964, p. 8).

III

It has already been stated that it is only in the Brāhmaṇical literature, i.e. the Purāṇas, that one gets a relatively cogent and comprehensive account of the Andhras (i.e. Sātavāhanas), though it is not historically flawless, as has been made clear.

The other category of literary evidence should come from the Buddhist or Pāli literature. It is, however, surprising that one hardly comes across any information regarding the history of the Andhras or Sātavāhanas in this category of literature. It must be mentioned here that it was during the regnal period of the Sātavāhanas that most of the Buddhist caves were excavated in Western India or Maharashtra which was under the control of this dynasty.

It is held that the famous Buddhist *āchāryas* Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva flourished during the period of the Sātavāhanas. It is also stated that some of the later Sātavāhana rulers like Vijaya Sātakarṇi were under the spell of Buddhism. The famous site of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa in Andhra Pradesh is associated with the name of the famous Buddhist *āchārya*.

There are scores of inscriptions in the Western Indian caves which attest to the wide patronage available to Buddhism. In spite of all these, Buddhist Pāli literature does not yield any information about the Sātavāhanas.

Compared to the Buddhist sources, the Jaina Prākṛit literature affords varied information about the Sātavāhanas, though not as a connected historical account but mostly in the form of legends, anecdotes and semi-historic stories. These are important as they yield information regarding the origin, literary achievements, conflict with Nahapāna, the conquests, the language used by the king, and such other information, though it does not seem to pertain to any specific Sātavāhana king.

The first and the foremost in Mahārāshṭrī Prākṛit literary creations attributed to a specific king of the Sātavāhana dynasty is the famous *Gāhāsattasaī* of king Hāla. It is

stated that he selected seven hundred out of a crore of *gāthās* which attests to his sense of aesthetics. However, the king is named `Sālāhaṇa' and designated as the compiler *(Sālāhaṇaviraiö)*. King Hāla is the seventeenth in the Purānic list. The reign-period assigned to him is only five years. The dating of Hāla depends on the acceptance of the earlier or later date for the founding of the dynasty. There is a wide divergence of opinion regarding the date of this composition, ranging between *c.* 1st cent AD and 6th cent. *AD*. Mirashi has shown that `*gāthas of* later poets were interpolated in *Sattasaī* from time to time.'[19]

Joglekar[20] in his Marāthī edition of *Gāthāsaptaśatī* has, in his critical introduction, given in details the cultural data of the times which throw light on the life-style of the people belonging mostly to the rural idiom. Mirashi[21] states: ''The *gāthās* portray the simple daily life in the villages of Mahārāshtṛa such as can be seen today. They describe scenes of love, humour, natural phenomena, pleasures and pains of human life and delicate feelings of men and women.'' However, taking into consideration the fact that 'some *gāthās* were interpolated in the anthology from time to time', the picture of cultural life as depicted in this anthology may not belong entirely to the Sātavāhana period.

The *chūrṇi* on the *Nisīhasutta*, a canonical text of the Jainas, gives an interesting account of the influence of Jaina *āchāryas* on the king Sālivāhana of Paiṭhan. Dated in *c.* the 7th cent AD the text recounts how the date of the *pajjusaṇa* festival of the Jainas was changed. ''According to the ancient tradition, the festival of *pajjusaṇa* could be held on *pūrṇimā* (full moon day), *pañchamī* (fifth day), *daśamī* (tenth day) or such other *pavva* days, but it was from the time of Ajja Kālaga (Kālaka) that the date of *pajjusaṇa* was changed from the 5th to the 4th of the bright half of Bhaddavaya (Bhādrapada) at the request of the king Sālivāhaṇa of Paiṭhaṇa (Mahārāshtṛa), as it coincided with the date of the Indra festival in his region. From this time, this festival came to be known as *Samaṇapūyā* among the people of Marahaṭṭha (*visaya*).[22]'' It may be mentioned that this Kālakāchārya waged war against king Gaddabhilla (Gardabhilla) of Ujjayinī (Ujjain) with the help of 94 kings from Persia as Gaddabhilla had kidnapped the nun-sister of the *āchārya*. (This episode has become the theme of several Jaina miniature paintings).

The *Bṛihatkalpasūtra*[23] (*c.* 8th century AD) refers to Śātavāhana, Sātavāhana, Sātāhaṇa, Sayavāhaṇa, Sālavāhaṇa and Sālivāhaṇa who ruled at Patiṭṭhāṇa on the Godāvarī. The *bhāshya* and the *vṛitti* on the text *(sūtras)* give a number of stories in explanation of the *sūtras*. Some of these incorporate stories about king `Sālavāhaṇa', two of which deserve mention here as they, though possibly legendary in nature, appear to contain some core of historical events.

The first of these (Vol. VI, pp. 1647-48) has been given in explanation of the term *dīptachitta* (one with excited mind) and tells us of the excited state of king Sātavāhana. It tells us that on the bank of the river Godāvarī was the city named Patiṭṭhāṇa (mod. Paiṭhan). Here ruled the king Sālavāhāṇa whose minister was Kharaga. Once the king ordered his army chief to capture the city of Mahurā and return. When he started on the campaign, he wondered which Mahurā (Mathurā) he was asked to conquer—Northern Mahurā or Southern Mahurā. Since the orders of the king were sharp, he did not dare to seek details. Therefore, he divided his army and conquered both the Mahurās. This was reported to the king. At the same time, another good news was brought that the chief queen had delivered a son. A third messenger reported that a huge treasure was discovered in the kingdom. Hearing these three good tidings, the king became mad with joy and he started pounding the bed, striking the pillars, hitting the walls and uttering irrelevant matter. The minister tried to pacify the king. When the king asked who did the damage, the minister told him that the king was himself responsible for it. The king, getting angry, kicked the minister, and the secret service persons took him away and kept him in secret place. After some time, the king called for the minister, on which the secret service people told him that he had been killed as he was rude to the king. The king was very unhappy and said that he had done a bad thing. Secret service persons told him that they will search for him as it is possible that the executioners (chāṇḍālas) might have kept him somewhere. The minister was then brought to the king and he was happy. The text quotes two verses which the king uttered when he was excited with several good news and became *dīptachitta*. They are:

Sachchaṁ bhaṇa Godāvari! puvvasamuddena Śāviyā Śaṁti
Sālāhaṇakulasarisaṁ, jati te kūle kulamatthi//
Uttarato himavaṁto, dāhinato sālivahaṇo rāyā/
Samabhārabharakkantā, teṇa na palhatthaë puhavī// (6246-47)
O Godāvarī ! tell the truth on oath,
administered by the eastern ocean,
whether there is any other family like
that of the Sālāhaṇas, on your banks.
[Is it not that] Because of Himālayas
in the north and the king Sālivāhaṇa in
the south, the earth does not get
overturned as it is well balanced [loaded
on both the ends].

It is not clear who this Sātavāhana king was, who was so boastful and possibly conscious of his prowess!

The same text (Vol. I, p. 52) also refers to the conflict between the Sālavāhana king and the king Nahavāhaṇa (also Naravāhaṇa) who had fortified himself in the city of Bharuyachha (Bharukachchha=modern Bharuch in Gujarat). It is stated that the Sālavāhana king used to confine Nahavāhana every year in Bharukachha. When the rains were on, he would return to his own town. Ultimately he conquered the city by stratagem with the help of minister Kharaga. It is clear that Naravāhaṇa is identical with Nahapāna who flourished, according to Sircar, in the first quarter of the second century AD.[24]

The *Lilāvaï* of Koühala (*c.* 9th century AD) in Prākṛit refers to the Siṁhala princess Lilāvatī having fallen in love with king Sātavāhana after seeing his portrait. Yet another literary source giving some information about the birth of Sālavāhaṇa is the famous *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga (14th century AD). It is stated that Sālavāhaṇa was born of the union between a Brāhmaṇa girl of Pratishṭhāna and the Nāga king Śesharāja. The lady, after giving birth to the son, started living in the potters' colony, as her relatives discarded her. In course of time, the boy grew up, became famous and evoked jealousy in the mind of Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī. The latter attacked Pratishṭhāna, but the boy made the clay images of horses, elephants and soldiers alive by sprinkling nectar procured from his father, the Nāga king, and defeated Vikramāditya. It may be mentioned here that the present day Paiṭhan has localities named as Nāgaghāṭ, Nāgaḍoha and the (supposed) site of a Sātavāhana palace.

Another piece of information comes from the *Bṛihatkathā* of Guṇādya. The date of Guṇāḍhya has been controversial (*c.* 2nd century AD), but he is supposed to have flourished at the court of king Sātavāhana (probably Hāla). It is stated that while the king was sporting with his queens in a well in his garden, he splashed water on them. The Brāhmaṇa queen said *Modakair-māṁ tāḍaya*, i.e., do not splash me with water. The king, not trained in Sanskṛit, understood it to mean: 'Hit me with *modakas*', and asked the servant to bring *modakas*. The queen, thereupon, chided the king for his ignorance of Sanskṛit. The king, thereon, requested the scholars of Sanskṛit at his court—Guṇāḍhya and Śarvavarman—to teach him Sanskṛit. Śarvavarman wrote the famous Sanskṛit grammar *Kātantra*, blessed as he was by the god Kārttikeya.

V

A survey of the literary data for the study of the Sātavāhanas brings out some features;

(i) The Purāṇas still remain *relatively* the best source for Sātavāhana history;

(ii) There is dearth of Pāli literature regarding this dynasty;

(iii) The Jaina sources are mostly in the form of stories and legends thou;h some seem to have some histrorical core in them;

(iv) The precise dating of these literary sources is controvertial; and

(v) The non-Brahmaṇical sources do not help in identifying the king/kings mentioned in the stories.

Notes and References

1. F.E. Pargiter, *DKA*, pp. vi-vii.
2. *Ibid.*, p.x.
3. R.C. Majumdar & A.D. Pusalkar (eds.), (1962), *The Classical Age*, p.298.
4. The name Simuka is not found in the Purāṇas and has been restored from a label inscription in the statue-gallery at Nāṇeghāṭ—Ed.
5. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-43, 71-72.
6. R.C. Majumdar & A.D. Pusalkar (eds.) (1968) *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p.99.
7. I.K. Sarma, (1980), *Coinage of the Sātavāhana Empire*, pp. 8-9.
8. S. Chattopadhyaya (1974), *Some Early Dynasties of South India*, Chapt.II.
9. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, p. 35, fn. 42.
10. Sarma, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
11. *Ibid.*, p.10.
12. Neither of the two Bhandarkars (R.G. and D. R.) was a protagonist of the early date for the rise of the Sātavāhana-power —Ed.
13. R.C. Majumdar, & A.D. Pusalkar, *op. cit.* (1968), p. 195.
14. Sarma, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
15. V.V. Mirashi (1981), *The History and Inscriptions of the Sātavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas*, p. 17.
16. In R.C. Majumdar, & A.D. Pusalkar, (eds.), (1968), p. 195.
17. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
    For a full discussion of the Purāṇic data, *Vide supra*, pp. 3ff. —Ed.
18. R.G. Bhandarkar (1928), *Early History of the Deccan*, p. 30.
19. Mirashi (1981), pp. 180-81.
20. S.A. Joglekar (1956), *Gathāsaptaśatī* (in Marāthī).
21. Mirashi (1981), p. 183.
22. Madhu Sen (1975), *A Cultural Study of Nisīṭha Cūrṇi*, pp. 323-24.
23. *Bṛihatkalpasūtrabhāshya* (1942 : Bhavnagar), Vol. VI, p. 165.
24. R.C. Majumdar & A.D. Pusalkar, (eds.) (1968), p. 180.
    Nahapāna actually flourished in the first century A.D. For evidence, *vide SWKHF*, pp. 65, 139-40 —Ed.

4

Greek and Latin Texts on the Andhras

B.N. MUKHERJEE

Several Greek and Latin texts refer or allude to the Andrae or Andhras. This was the name of a tribe or community (*jāti*), to which belonged the royal Sātavāhana family.[1] In view of the importance of this dynasty in the early history of India, the references or allusions to it or the Andhras in the early Greek and Latin sources deserve scrutiny. No doubt, most of them have been discussed in wrritings on the Sātavāhanas. But they are often quoted out of context, leading to wrong interpretations. Moreover, a few of the relevant notices have not been properly utilised or even have remained unutilised by scholars. Hence a discussion on these sources seems to be a desideratum for assessing their value for reconstructing the history of the Sātavāhana kingdom.

A well-known passage in the *Naturalis Historia* of Pliny states that ''Next come the Andrae, a more powerful tribe (*gens*), with great many villages and thirty towns fortified with walls and towers. They furnish their king with 100,000 infantry, 2000 cavalry and 1000 elephants''.[2] V.A. Smith,[3] and following him some other scholars,[4] accepted this passage as a quotation from the *Indika* by Megasthenes, the Seleucid envoy to the court of Chandragupta Maurya. This evidence, according to Smith, shows that in the days of Chandragupta Maurya (about the last quarter of the 4th century BC) the Andhra ''nation'' was ''independent'' and possessed ''a military force only second to that at the command of the king of Prasii, Chandragupta Maurya''.[5] This hypothesis, however, does not tally with the allusion to the Andhras in R.E. XIII of Chandragupta's grandson Aśoka as a people living in the king's domain (*rājavishaya*). One may argue that the Andhras were reduced to submission sometime after the date of the treatise of Megasthenes. But there is not a shred of evidence to that effect. Moreover, we can never be sure about the occurrence of the information utilised by Pliny in the treatise of Megasthenes, since the latter is lost. It should be clearly noted that in the sentence dealing with the Andrae, Pliny does not refer to Megasthenes (VI, XXII, 67). No

doubt, in another sentence of the section concerned Pliny cites an evidence of Megasthenes (VI, XXII, 69). But shortly after this he furnishes a statement on the authority of Artemidorus (VI, XXII, 70), who flourished in the late 2nd century BC. In fact, Pliny clearly indicated that in the section concerned (VI, XXII) he utilised several sources (VI, XXII, 65). If we remember that Pliny dedicated his *Historia Naturalis* in AD 77 when the Indo-Roman commerce had already gathered momentum,[6] it should be admitted that Pliny could have access to near contemporary as well as much older sources of information. Hence there is no difficulty in dating the source of Pliny's passage in question to sometime after the foundation of the Sātavāhana kingdom, probably in the second half of the 1st century *BC.*[7]

Strabo referred to an Indian embassy to Augustus on the authority of Nikolaos Damaskenos (*c.* 64 BC to early 1st century AD). Referring to the latter the *Geographikon* of Strabo states that ''This writer says that at Antiochia by Daphne he met with the Indian ambassadors who had been sent to Augustus Ceasar. It appeared from the letter that their number had been more than merely the three he reports that he saw. The rest had died chiefly in consequence of the length of the journey. The letter was written in Greek on parchment and imputed that Poros was the writer, and that though he was sovereign of 600 kings, he nevertheless sets high value on being Caesar's friend, and was willing to grant him a passage wherever he wished through his dominions and to assist him in any good enterprise''.[8] The embassy was accompanied by several servants carrying ''gifts'' and also 1 person other than the envoys. That person later committed suicide by burning himself at Athens.[9] According to Strabo, there was an inscription on his tomb referring to ''Zarmanochegas, an Indian from Bargosa, having immortalised himself according to the custom of his country, lies here''.[10]

The term *Sarmanachegas* is perhaps correctly considered to be corruption of the expression *śrmaṇāchārya*, signifying an ascetic teacher.[11] Bargosa certainly stands for Bharukachchha or Bhṛigukachchha of Indian sources, Barygara of Greek and Latin texts and modern Broach on the Narmadā in Western Deccan. Since during the period of the Roman ruler Augustus Caesar (27 BC-AD 14), the area of Broach was under the Sātavāhanas, the Indian king in question could have belonged to the same group. Of the names of the Sātavāhana kings, which or parts of which could have been corrupted in Greek texts as *Poros* were *Pulumāvi* and *Pūrṇotsaṅga.*[12] While the first name was assumed by a number of the Andhra or Sātavāhana rulers, none of them can be placed confidently in the age of Augustus. On the other hand, Pūrṇotsaṅga, though not referred to in epigraphs and coin legends, is mentioned as the fourth Andhra king in the majority of the Purāṇas having the dynastic lists.[13] So if the Sātavāhanas began to rule in the second half of the 1st century BC and if Purṇotsaṅga did exist, he could have reigned in the period of Augustus. Again, in view of the evidence of corruption

of Indian names in early Greek texts and of transformation of obscure names into more familiar ones having analogous sounds,[14] the first part of the name *Pūrṇotsaṅga* (i.e. *Pūrṇa*) as well as of *Puḷumāvi* (i.e. *Puḷu*) could have been substituted by the name *Poros*, so well known to the westerners because of the widely circulated news of the conflict between Alexander and an Indian king of that name, who ruled in a part of the north-west.[15]

The reference to the use of Greek for writing a letter sent by an Indian ruler need not cause surprise, since during the period concerned it was the language of the diplomatic world. The material on which the letter was written was probably a palm leaf (or birch bark?), again mistaken by a westerner for a parchment known to him as a usual writing material.

If in the passage quoted we have the evidence of a Sātavāhana embassy to the court of Augustus, it may be taken as an early attempt by the Indian ruling family to have favourable commercial relationship with the Roman empire. The envoys could have travelled by ship from Bhṛigukachchha to the head of the Persian Gulf and thence through, *inter alia*, an overland route touching Antioch in Syria. The assurance of assistance in any good enterprise given in the letter of the Indian king may allude to offering of attractive terms of transactions to the Roman empire (or its entrepreneurs).[17]

That there was a special relationship between the Roman Orient and the Sātavāhanas is indicated by the *Periplous tes Erythras Thalasses*, datable to *c.* 1st century AD.[18] One of its sections states that "The marts of this region, one after the other, are Akabarou (generally emended as Barygaza), Souppara and the city of Kalliena, which in the time of elder Saraganes became a lawful market town (*emporion enthesmon)*; but since it came under Sandanes, it is much obstructed, and the Greek ships which by chance enter there are sent under guard to Barygaza."[19]

The base of the transliterated form *Saragan(es)* can be recognised as *Sātakarṇi* (*Saraagana<Sādagaṇa<Sātakaṇa<Sātakarṇa< = Sātakarni*). It is known to have been assumed by several Sātavāhana kings. In the Purāṇic list of the Andhra (Sātavāhana) rulers appears the name *Sunandana*, which could have been corrupted into *Sandana* (*Sandanes*). In that case Sandanes can be identified with Sunandana and Saraganes with one of the kings with the name *Sātakarṇi* placed earlier than the former in the Purāṇic list.[20]

The king of Barygaza or Broach was Manbanos, who, according to the text under review, was the lord of the country of Ariake, which included Barygaza.[21] Manbanos has been identified with Nahapāna, the Kshatrapa ruler of Western India in *c.* 1st-2nd century or rather 1st century AD.[22]

Kalliena (i.e. Kalyāṇa near Mumbai) had become a ''lawful market town'' during the reign of an early Sātakarni. The designation *enthesmos* ''lawful'', attributed to an ''emporion'' in the *Periplous tes Erythras Thalasses* or the term ''*emporion*'' itself as used by Ptolemy had special significance in the context of the Roman empire's trade with the East. At the marts referred to as such, the merchants from the Roman empire enjoyed special or concessional trading facilities.[23] At Mouziris (Muchiri near the mouth of the Periyār river in Kerala), designated as an ''emporion'' by Ptolemy,[24] there was a temple named after the Roman emperor Augustus.[25] This apparently suggests a settlement of people from the Roman Orient at that port. The same place is referred to in a text in a recently noticed papyrus, unearthed in Egypt. It is inscribed on both the sides and is palaeographically datable to the middle of the 2nd century AD. One of its sides records a contract for business loan drawn up at Mouziris. The other side, written in Alexandria, records the arrival of Indian goods through a maritime-cum-overland route.[26] Obviously there was a close and special relationship between the Roman Orient and Mouziris.[27]

There might have been a similar contract between the Roman commerce and Kalliena. If the passage from Strabo's *Geographikon*, discussed above, really implies an attempt on the part of an early Sātāvāhana monarch to enter profitably into the Indo-Roman commerce, the passage under review suggests it was fruitful by the time of a ruler called Sātakarṇi. The term ''elder'' attributed to Saraganes (Sātakarṇi) may indicate him as one of the early Sātavāhana monarchs of that name.

The obstruction of Kalyāṇa of the Sātavāhana domain was caused by Nahapāna obviously with the aim of imposing an economic sanction and thereby weakening the Sātavāhana power. That Nahapāna was successful in conquering western Deccan is proved by the evidence of the epigraphs referring to his rule. However, as evident from epigraphic and numismatic sources, he was ultimately ousted by the Sātavāhana sovereign Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi. A commentary on a *gāthā* of the Jaina work *Āvaśyaka-sūtra* also refers to the success of Sālavāhana (a Sātavāhana king) against Naravāhaṇa (or Nahavāṇa, i.e. Nahapāna).[28] The *Periplous tes Erythras Thalasses* thus refers to one of the early phases of Sātavāhana-Kshatrapa struggle.[29]

We may now turn our attention to the evidence of Ptolemy's *Geographike Huphegesis*, written in about the middle of the 2nd century AD on the basis of earlier and also nearly contemporary sources. Ptolemy explicitly stated that he had gathered much information from people hailing form Timula (or Simylla) (i.e. modern Chaul) (I, 17). So in respect of his infiormation about the western side of the Indian peninsula he could have been fairly up-to-date.

Larike (Lar+ike), as described by Ptolemy, not only included Lāṭa (>Lāḍha> Lār)

between the Māhī and Tāpti,[30] but also territories beyond this area. So it was a geo-political unit. According to Ptolemy, it included such far-flung localities like Barygaza (Broach), Minnagara (Mīnadaśapura>Mandasor?), Tiatoura (<Chittaura < Chitrapura = Chitor?), Nasika (Nāsik) and Ozene (Ujjain).[31] The last noted place is described as ''the royal city of Tiastenes''. Thus parts of Gujarat, Western Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan were under Tiastenes, identifiable with Chashṭana.[32] Since he ruled at least from the year 11 to 52 (of the Śaka era) or AD 88/89 to 129/130, Ptolemy's information about him is to be considered as fairly up-to-date.

Ptolemy may be expected to have been similarly updated about his information on Ariakes Sadinon, the coastal area of which is placed immediaṭely after (i.e. to the south of) Larike.[33] Different variations of this name in the Greek and Latin manuscripts of Ptolemy's treatise suggest that it denotes the Āryaka (territory or division) of the Sātavāhanas (i.e. of their kingdom).[34] This inference is supported by the reference to Baithana, as the ''royal seat of Siri Polemaios''.[35] Baithana has been identified with Pratishṭhānapura (or Paiṭhan), the traditional seat of the Sātavāhana power and the name *Siri Polemaios* may well have been a transliteration of the name Śri-Pulumavi, by which a number of the Sātavāhana kings were known.[36] If there was no great interval between the date of Ptolemy's information about the domain of Tiastenes and that regarding Polemaios of the contiguous territory, then the Sātavāhana ruler in question can be identified with Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi, the son and successor of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi.[37]

No doubt, one of the localities, Hipporoura, of Ariakes Sadinon is described as ''the royal seat of Baleokouros''[38] who can be identified with one of two Kura kings of Kolhāpur bearing the name or title *Vilivāyakura*.[39] But the information about the association of Balaeokouros with Hippokoura could have been culled from a source somewhat earlier than the reign of Puḷumāvi.[40] In certain cases Ptolemy is known to have telescoped pieces of information of two different periods in this manner.[41]

Identifiable localities of Ariakes Sadinon like Soupara (Sopārā), Simylla (Chaul), Hippokoura (Ghodęgāon), Baltipatna (Dabhol or Baipatna in S. Konkan?), Tagara (Ter), Baithana (Paiṭhan), Hippokoura (Kolhāpur), and Banabasi (Vanavāsī)[42] indicate inclusion of extensive areas of Western and Central Deccan within the terrritory in question. But if Polemaios was Vāśishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi, who had also parts of Eastern Deccan under him,[43] the latter areas should also have been within the limits of Ariakes Sadinan. One explantion may be that some of the unidentified places of this territory could have been in Eastern Deccan. Otherwise, we may have to accept the name *Ariakes Sadinon* as denoting the Āryaka division of the empire, leaving out the Eastern Deccan, which could have bee traditionally a part of the southern section[44] (Dakshiṇa including the Drāviḍa region). The existence of two linguistically (and perhaps also to

some extent culturally?) separable divisions of the Sātavāhana kingdom is suggested by the evidence of the legends on the silver coins of Vāśishthīputra Puḷumāvi and some of his successors. While the obverse legends are in Prākrit, the reverse inscriptions allude to a Draviḍian or Proto-Draviḍian dialect.[45]

A section of Eastern Deccan was included by Ptolemy within Maisolia. Its identifiable river like the Maisolos (Kṛishṇā) and localities like Kontakosyla emporion (Kaṇaṭakasela or modern Ghaṇṭasāla), Koddoura (Guḍuru near Masulipaṭam), Bardamana (Vardhamāna or modern Vaḍḍamānu near Amarāvatī), etc.[46] suggest the inclusion of the Kṛishṇā-Guṇṭūr area of Andhra Pradesh.[47] The same or a portion of the same territory seems to have been mentioned as Masalia in the *Periplous tes Erythras Thalasses.*[48]

Ptolemy's treatise refers to the Maisolia, the country, Maisolos the river, and Maisoloi, the people. The Indian base of all these names seems to be Mosala. This name reminds us of the Mosalas, cited in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata together with the Kosalas and Tosalas.[49]

It appears that up to *c.* 1st century AD or even perhaps up to about the second quarter of the 2nd century AD, the Kṛishṇā-Guṇṭūr area was not known as the Andhra country. This area was connected with the name *Andhra* in the Moyidavolu inscription of the Pallava prince Śivaskandavarman of *c.* 4th century AD. The record contains an order to a *vāpata* (*vyāpṛita* or "employed" officer) stationed at Dhañakaḍa (Dhānyakaṭaka located in the Amarāvatī-Dharaṇikoṭ area of the Guṇṭūr district) regarding the grant of a village in Aṁdhapata (Andhrāpatha).[50]

The area seems to have become associated with the name of the Andhras sometime in the late 2nd century or later and before the date of the last noted record of the 4th century AD. The reason might have been its having been one of the last strongholds of the Andhras (Sātavāhanas).[51] In any case, the testimonies of the *Periplous tes Erythras Thalasses* and the *Geographike Huphegesis* prove that at least in the 1st century AD or even a little later the name Andhra as denoting a territory had not been associated with eastern Deccan. This finally nullifies the old theory locating the homeland of the Andhras (Sātavāhanas) in the area between the Kṛishṇā and Godāvarī, which is traditionally in the Andhra country.[52]

The last reference to the Andhras in classical sources appears in the *Tabula Peutingeriana.* This map is substantially based on an original drawn during the reign of Augustus and corrected up to the end of the 2nd century AD.[53] It mentions, *inter alia*, different areas now included in the Indian subcontinent. Among them is Andre Indi.[54] Apparently a large area of the Indian subcontinent is denoted by this name.[55]

The above survey of the references to the Andhras in the Greek and Latin sources

indicates their importance in reconstructing the history of the Sātavāhana kingdom. However, in the degree of importance these cannot be compared favourably with the epigraphic or numismatic sources.[56]

Notes and References

1. H.C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 7th edition, 1972, pp. 356f. The royal family in question is referred to as Sātavāhana in the famous Nāsik *praśasti*, whereas its founder member is mentioned in the Purāṇas as belonging to the Andhra tribe or community.
2. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, VI, XXII, 67.
3. V.A. Smith, *The Early History of India*, 4th edition, Oxford, 1924, pp. 217-18.
4. D.R. Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, 3rd edition, Calcutta, 1955, p. 32; G. Yazdani (editor), *The Early History of the Deccan*, London, 1960, pp. 76-77, etc. See also K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, *A History of South India*, Madras, 1966, p. 92.
5. V.A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 217-18.
6. B.N. Mukherjee, *Economic Factors in Kushāṇa History* (hereinafter *EFKH*), Calcutta, 1970, pp. 13 and 19 n. 21. See also Pliny, *op. cit.*, preface, sec. 3. It is believed that revisions were made till the time of Pliny's death in 79 AD.
7. B.N. Mukherjee, "The Problem of Fixing the Initial Period of the Sātavāhana Coinage", *Indian Studies—Past and Present*, Vol. VII, no. 1, 1965, pp. 65-68.

   Vide also *supra*, pp. ff. -Ed.
8. Strabo, *Geographikon*, XV, I, 73.
9. *Ibid.*
10 *Ibid.* See also Dio Cassius, *Romaike (H)istoria*, LIV, 9.
11. J.W. McCrindle, *Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature*, Westminster, 1901, p. 78, n. 1.
12. F.E. Pargiter, *DKA*, p. 39.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 39 and n. 32; Mala Datta, *A Study of the Sātavāhana Coinage*, New Delhi, 1990, p. 230.
14. Thus five syllabic name *Paṭaliputra* was corrupted into *Palibothra* having four syllables. Again, in some manuscripts of Ptolemy's *Geography* the name *Taṅgaṇa* is replaced by Ganganoi (VII, 2, 13; L. Renou, *La Geographie Ptolemee de l'Inde*, Paris, 1925, p. 51 and fn), apparently under the influence of the well-known name of the Ganges.
15. This information seems to be one of the factors which influenced E.H. Warmington to place the Poros in question in the north-west of the Indian subcontinent.
16. A section of Strabo's *Geographikon* states that "From one place in India and from one king, Pandion, but according to other writers, Poros, there came to Caesar Augustus gift

and an embassy'' (XV, 1, 4). Here Strabo made the mistake of taking two embassies, one from Poros and one from a Pandya king, as one.

17. B.N. Mukerjee, *The Rise and Fall of the Kushāṇa Empire*, Calcutta, 1988, p. 408.
18. B.N. Mukherjee, *The Kushānas and the Deccan*, Calcutta, 1968 (hereafter *KD*), pp. 133 f.
19. *Periplous tes Erythras Thalasses*, sec. 52.
20. F.E. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-41. See also below n. 22.
21. *Periplous* etc., sec. 41.
22. *KD*, pp. 104-9. L. Casson is wrong in identifying Sandanes as an official in charge of Nahapāna's ''newly acquired possession'' including Kalliena (*Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, vol. XXVI, 1983, pp. 164-77; *Periplus Mares Erythraei*, edited by L. Casson, p. 215). It is well-known that after conquering an area now in western Maharashṭra (including Kalyāṇa) Nahapāna appointed Ushavadāta as its ruler.
23. *EFKH*, pp. 47-48.
24. Ptolemy, *Geogrphike Huphegesis*, VII, 1,8.
25. K. Miller, *Die Peutigersche Tfel*, Stuttgart, 1962, map, segment XII, 4-5.
26. H. Harrauer and P.J. Sijpesteijn, ''Ein neus Dokument zu Romes Indienhandel P. Vindob, G 40822'', *AnzWien*, no. 122, 1985, pp. 124-55; V. Begley and R.D. de Puma (editors), *Rome and India—The Ancient Sea Trade*, Madras, 1992, p. 30.
27. A Roman trading station is claimed to have been discovered at Arikamedu near Pondicherry, at or near which was Ptolemy's Podouke emporion (VII, I, 14) (*Ancient India*, no. 2, p. 124).
28. *Āvaśyaka sūtra, uttarārdha, pūrvabhāga* (published by the Agamodaya Samiti, 1973 V.S., folios 712-713; vol. XVI, 1930, p. 288); K.A. Nilakanta Sastri (editor), *A Comprehensive History of India*, vol. II, Calcutta, 1957, p. 279.
29. *Ibid.*
30. Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, VII, I 4-5 and 62-63; *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol. I, pt. I, p. 7.
31. Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, VI, I, 4-5 and 62-63.
32. *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol. I, pt. I, p. 540.
33. Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, VII, I, 6 and 82-83.
34. *Ariakes* of the Greek and *Aricha* (or *Arica*) of the Latin manuscripts indicate Ariaka<Āryaka as the Indian base. The word *Sadan(on)* [or its variants *Sadenon*, *Sadinon*, *adan (on)*, *Aden(on)* and *Adin(an)* of the Greek manuscripts and *Sandano (rum)* and *Sadano(rum)* of the Latin manuscripts] can be philologically connected with the name *Sātavāhana* (*KD*, pp. 32-34; L. Renou, *La Geographie de Ptolemée l'Inde*, VII, 1-4, Paris, 1925, p. 3). In some translations of the *Geography* the term *Ariakes* has been wrongly attributed also to the country of the pirates (VII, 1, 7). But this does not occur in early manuscripts.
35. Ptolemy *op. cit.*, VII, I, 82.

36. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 279; F.E. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, pp. 40f.
37. J.N. Majumdar-Sastri, *McCrindle's Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy*, Calcutta, 1927, p. 177.
38. Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, VII, I, 82.
39. B.N. Mukherjee, ''Political Relations between the Sātavāhanas and the Kuras, the Mahāraṭhis and the Ānandas of South-Western Deccan'', *Our Heritage*, vol. XI, pt. II, 1963, pp. 61f; M. Datta, *op. cit.*, pp. 148f. The evidence of stratified coins, a number of Kura coins restruck by the Kuras themselves and a few other data suggest that Mahārathi Kura, Mahārathi [Vilivā] yakura, Mahāraṭhi Māḍhariputra Sivalakura, and king Gautamīputra Viḷivāyakura and the Sātavāhana monarch Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi controlled the Kolhāpur area in the order mentioned. So when the Kuras ruled as kings they were not under the supremacy of the Sātavāhanas. The latter might have been earlier served by the Kuras as Mahāraṭhis. The Kuras were ultimately ousted by Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi.
40. *Our Heritage*, 1963, vol. XI, pt. II, p. 67.
41. W.W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, Cambridge, 1951, pp. 231f.
42. Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, VII, I, 82-83.
43. M. Datta, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
44. According to an Indian concept, the southern country included the Godāvarī (in eastern Deccan) (*Mahābhārata*, Vanaparvan edited by H. Siddhānta-Vāgīsa, 73, 1-2).
45. M. Datta, *op. cit.*, pp. 49f and 216. The Sātavāhana silver coins with a bust on the obverse and legends on both the sides were probably meant for circulation throughout the kingdom (B.N. Mukherjee, *A Plea for the Study of Art in Coinage*, Varanasi, 1983, p. 43).
46. Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, VII, 15 and 93.
47. Benagouron, a city of the Salakenoi, (VII, I, 79), is generally identified with ancient Vengīpura and modern Pedda-Vegi in the Godāvarī district. The Salakenoi or Śālaṅkāyanas are also described as living ''above'' the Maisoloi.
48. See 62.
49. Bharata, *Nāṭyaśāstra* (Kāvyamālā edition), XIII, 17; B.M. Barua, *Old Brāhmī Inscriptions from Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri Caves*, Calcutta, 1929, p. 40, n. 2 and p. 68.
50. *EI*, VI, p. 87; XXXV, p. 6.
51. The latest stronghold, however, was Vidarbha, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, *EHDPP*, pp. 38-44.
52. E.J. Rapson, *BMC, AWK* etc. p. XVI. See also V.A. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 218.
53. E.H. Banbury, *A History of ancient Geography*, 2nd edition, London, pp. 696-97.
54. K. Miller, *op. cit.*, segment XII, 4-5 of the map.
55. *Ibid.*; *Monthly Bulletin, The Asiatic Society*, July, 1967, p. 6.
56. M. Datta, *op. cit.*, pp. 238f.

5

The Sātavāhana Epoch : An Ecological Perspective

M.K. DHAVALIKAR

A glance at the different phases of Indian history is enough to convince any one that there were only two phases of prosperity: one from *c.* 2500-2000 BC when the Indus civilization was at its zenith, and second, in the early centuries around the Christian era when the Sātavāhanas were ruling in the Deccan and the Kushāṇas in the north whereas all the remaining phases are marked by varying degrees of decline and decay. The main factor, which is common to both these phases, is obviously the flourishing foreign trade, with Mesopotamia in the earlier period in the latter half of the third millennium, and later, with the Roman empire in the early historical period. The question that then naturally arises is : Why did this cultural efflorescence take place only during these two epochs and not during the other phases ? It must be stated that foreign trade, though a very important factor, was not the only cause of the undreamt of prosperity but other factors were also equally important, because it can legitimately be asked why there was no foreign trade worth the name in other periods. A very important factor, the role of which has not yet been adequately recognised in Indian history, is environment.

It is now generally agreed that environment plays a very important role in shaping human cultures. In fact, the definition of culture, according to the protagonists of New or Processional Archaeology is that, it is an extra-somatic means of adaptive system that is employed in the integration of society with its environment and with other socio-cultural systems.[1] What is more, it has been argued that ''like environments evoke like cultural responses''. If we examine the culture process of the Sātavāhana times from this perspective, there is little doubt that we will be in a better position to appreciate the flowering of the Indian genius in all the different fields of human activity during the early historic period.

It will be pertinent to understand as to what was the situation in Central India and the Deccan—which was the Sātavāhana territory—before the rise of the Sātavāhanas.

Archaeological evidence indicates that this area was dotted with self-sufficient villages of the early farming communities in the second millennium BC. Their mixed economy was based on subsistence farming, stock-raising and hunting-fishing.[2] But these remained poor village cultures and could not rise to the urban status. It has been suggested that they could not cultivate the hard, compact black cotton soil in the absence of iron plough and consequently died as poor village cultures.[3] But the principal cause, it appears, was the deterioration of environment. It has been observed that the climate was getting more and more arid, the rainfall getting less and less and hence these agricultural communities were forced to desert their habitations and resort to sheep-goat-pastoral nomadism.[4] This deterioration of climate was a universal phenomenon, for almost all over the Old World farming societies had abandoned their settlements in the beginning of the first millennium BC.[5] In Central India and the Deccan the sites remained unoccupied for over five centuries, and were inhabited again only with the rise of the Sātavāhana power. At a few sites like Prakāsh, the beginning of settlement may go to a still earlier period, but at a vast majority of sites, the settlement occurs only in the Sātavāhana times.

No human culture can flourish in an adverse environment, and conversely, a congenial environment will certainly be conducive to human cultures. How do we reconstruct the past environment? Archaeologists now have a battery of scientific methods at their command for studying the past environment.[6] Considerable work has so far been done in the Western world in reconstructing the prehistoric environment as a result of which we now possess a fairly good knowledge of fluctuations in past environment. In India, however, environmental archaeology has not received the attention it merits. The beginnings have been made at Deccan College, Pune, and Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad.[7] Their work, however, is confined to the prehistoric period, and our knowledge of the environment during the early historic period is almost next to nothing. How do we then reconstruct the environment of the historical periods? We have to depend on minor scraps of evidence provided in our ancient literature and epigraphical sources. But there is a yet another source which comes to our aid, but it has to be used with some caution. Scientists have noted that whenever there is an intensely cold climate in the temperate zone like Europe, the tropical countries like India suffer droughts. Sulman has explicitly stated that, ''Whenever the high latitudes cool, monsoons tend to fail''.[8] No satisfactory explanation of this curious phenomenon has been offered as yet. Similarly it also appears that when the temperate lands experience a warm climate, countries like India enjoy a wet phase with adequate rainfall.[9] According to a renowned authority, ''Climate is a worldwide system. Significant changes cannot take place in one part without changes occurring in other places. There are dynamic connections that interlink climatic changes in various parts of the

globe''.[10] It is now well established that climatic changes tend to be nearly synchronous globally. The climatic world is one world''.[11]

It should be clear that although we do not have much evidence for climatic changes in the ancient past, we can to a certain extent visualize as to what was the environment like in the early historic period. It may be noted in this context that the Indian civilization flourished in the third millennium BC when the climate was extremely congenial. Palynological studies of the lake sediments in Rajasthan, which is now almost a desert, indicate that the region enjoyed a wet climate with a rainfall ranging between 500 and 600 mm, but the civilization declined with the onset of aridity in the beginning of the second millennium BC. It became intensely arid, almost desert-like from *c.* 1200 BC and the same was the case in most of the areas in the Old World. It is noteworthy that amelioration takes place from *c.* 500 BC and the climate becomes congenial when civilizations flourished. The period of thousand years from *c.* 500 BC to 500 AD witnessed the rise of empires in Europe and Asia, the Hellenic, the Hellenistic and the Roman in Europe, the Maurya, Śuṅga and Sātavāhana in India, the Persian empire, and the Hān empire in China. How could this happen? The common factor was the congenial environment.

Although our knowledge of our past environment is almost nil, it is possible ot form some idea from the general trend in other parts of the world. The period from about 500 BC to 500 AD is characterised by a warm phase in Europe and glaciers in the Alps started retreating from 300 BC to 400 AD.[12] It is known as the Atlantic phase. In Egypt this period is marked by high floods in the Nile indicating excellent rainfall. It is this evidence from Egypt which goes a long way in inferring that in India too rainfall must have been quite good. This may appear far-fetched, but it has now been established on the basis of the rainfall records in India which are available from 1840 onwards. They were used in 1910 by Sir Gilbert Walker, the then Director General of the Indian Meteorological Department, to study the variability of rainfall deficiency, first from 1843-60 and the other from 1895-1907. He concluded that the monsoon fluctuations tend to occur simultaneously over large areas of Africa and South Asia because

> ''In as much as the Nile flood is determined by monsoon rainfall of Abyssinia, and as the moist winds which provide this rainfall travel in the earlier portion of their movement side by side with those which ultimately reach the north of the Arabian Sea, there is a tolerably close correspondence between the abundance of the Nile flood and that of the monsoon rains of northwest India.... It would, thus, appear legitimate to utilise the Nile data for indicating at any rate approximately the character of the variation to which Indian monsoon is liable.[13]

In the last century, north Africa and India experienced common intervals of droughts and in the present both the regions faced weak monsoons between the sixties and the seventies.[14] The annual Nile floods are the direct consequence of the summer monsoon rainfall over the catchment basin of the Blue Nile in the high lands of Ethiopia. Thus the maximum flood level of the river indicates the magnitude of rainfall. Formerly the records of the levels of the Nile were available from 622 AD when every year the water level was recorded by the 'Nilometer', a gauge located on the island of Roda at Cairo. But now even a five thousand-year-old record has become available on a large stone stele known as the Palermo stone.[15]

This correspondence between the Nile floods and rainfall pattern in India was noted even by Alexander's historians.[16] Arrian's remarks suggest increased rainfall in India during Alexander's time and the same is confirmed by the testimony of Kauṭilya (Ch. XXIV, Section 116). According to him, the rain that falls in the country of *Jāṅgala* (desert regions) was half as much as in moist countries, but in the case of countries which were fit for agriculture, 23 *droṇas* (i.e. 46 inches) in Avanti which is roughly the Mālwā region of the present state of Madhya Pradesh whereas in the Aśmaka country, which is identified with central Maharashtra[17], it was 13½ *droṇas* (i.e. 27 inches) and an immense quantity in Aparānta (Koṅkaṇa). This would show that the rainfall in the early historical period was somewhat more than what it is at present. The monsoon was probably regular and vigorous and hence its pattern was observed by a Greek sailor Hippalus, who is credited with its discovery, in 44 AD.

It is evident that environment has played a very important role in making the personality of the Deccan where the Sātavāhanas ruled for over three centuries. The region witnessed flowering of the culture when the environment was congenial and the quality of life deteriorated when conditions were adverse. In all the four thousand years of the history of the Deccan from the beginning of the settled life, the region witnessed many vicissitudes, politically and culturally as well, but one gathers the general impression that it is only the Sātavāhana epoch which is marked by cultural efflorescence as it was only during this period that there was tremendous progress in every field of human activity. This may appear rather a bold statement, but if we ransack the available evidence—archaeological and literary—we are led to no other conclusion. It is probably because of the congenial environment that empires rose in different parts of the Old World in the early historical period.

We do not really know much as to what was the situation in the Deccan before the rise of the Sātavāhanas. Aśmaka, central Maharashtra, was a Mahājanapada in the time of Buddha and Mahāvīra with its capital at Pratishṭhāna (Paiṭhan). Slightly later, some other states also come into being. We hear of Aparānta (Koṅkaṇa), Mūlaka (between Ajantā ranges and the Godāvarī valley), Ṛishika (Khāndesh) region in the Tāpī valley),

Kuntala (Satārā, Kolhāpur and Belgāum districts) and Vidarbha. All these were perhaps conquered by the Nandas and hence became part of the Mauryan empire. We need not here go into the problem of the initial year of the Sātavāhana rule, but the third-second century BC marks the spread of habitation all over the Deccan. It appears that *rāshṭra* was an administrative unit and hence the people have been referred to as Rāshṭrikas in Aśokan edicts. Mahāraṭhis were perhaps chieftains. With the downfall of the Mauryan empire the various *rāshṭras* constituted the dominions of the Sātavāhana kingdom. It is highly likely that Maharashtra acquired its name during this period.

The rise of the Sātavāhanas also marks the rise of urban centres in the Deccan. This need not be surprising in view of the fact even in North India it takes place in the fourth century BC as has been clearly established by A. Ghosh.[18] How did the urbanization become possible in the Deccan? Among the several factors which were responsible for this, the first and foremost probably was the tremendous growth of population. In the preceding Chalcolithic period only major river basins were occupied, and that too sporadically. But in the Sātavāhana times, habitation spread to different parts and even the high rainfall areas of the Koṅkaṇa were occupied. In contrast to the Chalcolithic period, cities such as Pratishaṭhāna (Paiṭhan), Bhogavardhana (Bhokardan), Nāsikya (Nāsik), Śūrpāraka (Sopārā) and many others emerged. Although it is hard to compute the population precisely, there is little doubt that it was considerable.

The demographic expansion is matched by increase in agricultural production. With the introduction of full-fledged iron technology, the black soil could be effectively cultivated by means of an iron plough. It may be stated in this context that iron has been said to be the prime mover in the progress towards urbanizations, but it is enigmatic that although iron begins to occur in the Deccan well before 1000 BC, it took more than some six centuries for the urbanization to occur. The same is the situation in North India. The only factor that was common to both the regions is the adverse environment; the situation improved when it became congenial. It is only because of the improved rainfall in the early historic period that in the Deccan a number of cereals such as wheat, barely, jowar and rice as also a variety of pulses began to be cultivated. Barley, which was the principal cereal in the Chalcolithic period, continued to be cultivated even in the Sātavāhana period. The *Bhāvāprakāśa* of Bhāvamiśra refers to five kinds of barley which was grown in the Godāvarī valley.[19] The crops attest to the practice of harvesting the *kharīf* and *rabī* crops as at present. Although there are no winter rains in the Deccan, the rotation of crops could be possible because of well irrigation. Paddy cultivation made possible the colonization of the coastal areas. The congenial climate helped in creating a strong agricultural base.

The establishment of the Sātavāhana rule in the Deccan ushered in a new era of

prosperity. But for the brief Kashatrapa interlude in the first quarter of the second century AD,[20] the three centuries of the Sātavāhana rule are marked by considerable peace and prosperity. They ruled with a firm hand, appointed Mahāraṭhis over provinces of the empire, collected revenue vigorously, introduced a new system of coinage of copper, lead, potin, silver and even electrum. They revived Vedic sacrifices, but were tolerant as is evident from the numerous Buddhist cave temples which constitute excellent examples of monumental architecture. They ruled over a vast empire south of the Vindhyas which straddled between the Narmadā and the Kṛishṇā and from coast to coast. Their administration was to some extent decentralised; the local chieftains, who were conquered and were appointed as Mahāraṭhis and Mahābhojas, seemed to have enjoyed a modicum of autonomy.

Rural Deccan flourished as never before and has never since. The idyllic charm of the village life is portrayed in the *Gāthā-saptaśatī*. Farmers cultivated a variety of crops by rotation. Although canal irrigation existed in North India much earlier under the Mauryas, it does not seem to have been introduced in the Deccan possibly because of the rugged, undulating terrain; but there is convincing evidence of well irrigation. The Nāsik cave inscription of Ṛishabhadatta shows that digging of wells and tanks was a meritorious act and a matter of pride.[21] There was a specialised class of technicians who have been referred to as *odayantrikas* as they worked on water engines which Kauṭilya in his *Arthaśāstra* (Ch. XXIV) calls *sroto-yantra*. They were organized into guilds.[22] This water engine was probably the same as the water-lifting machine called *rahaṭṭa-ghaḍiya* or *arahaṭṭa* which was a wheel with water-pots.[23]

The farmer was deeply attached to his land, then as now, and it appears that even the ruling chief could not take it away without due compensation. In one case, the ruler had to make cash payment to purchase land from a farmer.[24] It is hard to accept that the subjects of the Sātavāhana rulers could not sell and purchase land for secular purposes as there is not a simple record to that effect.[25] The iron plough enabled the farmer to cultivate land effectively and this in turn produced the surplus; as a consequence, there arose a class of rich farmers referred to as *gahapatis*. The prosperity of the Sātavāhana epoch was based on this strong agrarian foundation.

A noteworthy feature of the Sātavāhana society is the social stratification. A new class of prosperous agriculturists like the sugar barons of our own times was emerging in this period. These *gahapatis* (householders) frequently figure in epigraphs as donors of Buddhist monastic establishments. The *kuḍubins* (cultivators) appear to be at a lower level than *gahapatis*, and their social status was probably the same as that of the small farmers—the Kuṇbīs—today. In the administrative hierarchy were the Mahāraṭhis, who were probably governors or may even be tributary chiefs enjoying a measure of autonomy, for they were permitted to issue their own currency.[26]

Arts and crafts received a tremendous boost with rise in patronage. The Sātavāhana period is marked by craft specialization. Although there is evidence to show that there was some rudimentary craft specialization even in the Chalcolithic period, the development of crafts under the Sātavāhanas was phenomenal. This is attested by literary evidence and concrete proof is provided by excavations. Bhokardan (ancient Bhogavardhana) was an important manufacturing centre,[27] Paiṭhan (Pratishṭhāna) and Ter (Tagara) vied with each other for excellence in textiles, Aparānta produced weapons.[28] Sopārā (Śūrpāraka) near Mumbai was the most important port. According to the Buddhist tradition, it was a royal seat and a great centre of commerce during the time of Buddha and its importance continued even later in the Sātavāhana times. Besides, there were many fortified towns, the number of which, according to Pliny, was thirty.[29] At Sanatti (Dist. Gulberga, Karnataka) the fortification walls still stand to a height of 10 to 15 ft. All this no doubt was due to brisk trade which further flourished because of excellent network of communications. The Jātaka stories convey a fair idea of the road system not only within the state but also that connecting it with the Gaṅgā valley (Uttarāpatha).

The rock-cut caves testify to the art activity, but even such artists as ivory-carvers (*danta-kāra*) and goldsmiths (*hiraṇya-kāra*) were flourishing. This would show that even luxury goods were in great demand not only in the country, but even beyond its frontiers. Thus far Pompeii ivory, identified as Śrī Lakshmī—the goddess of beauty, was supposed to have been fashioned in Mathurā, but now we can be certain that it was the handiwork of an ivory-carver of Bhokardan (Dt. Aurangabad) where *two* such figurine, identical with the Pompeii specimen, were found.[30] One of them is fragmentary and the other is complete and is in an excellent state of preservation. Specimens of gold jewellery have been recovered from Amarāvatī and jewellery moulds have been found at several Sātavāhana sites.[31] They attest to the skill of the *hiraṇyakāras*. *Gandhikas* manufactured perfumes, and wove chaplets of nard and silk of many colours and soaked them in unguent which were then exported to Rome.[32] These artisans were organized into guilds, references to which abound in Western Indian cave inscriptions. Guilds gave donations and received deposits from people which is an indication of their financial health and peoples' faith in their functioning. They seem to have been under rigorous control of the administration, for they were not allowed to issue their own coinage as was the case in the North.

This undreamt of prosperity was due to the flourishing trade with the Roman empire. This trade was carried through Egypt and was controlled by Arab middlemen. There were two routes to Egypt which, however, were not used extensively before the Ptolemaic period. One was sea route along the coast of Arabia and up the Red Sea to Heroonpolite, and the other was the ancient land route from North India through Iran

and Iraq. The former was used during the Sātavāhana times. During the Roman period Egypt imported from India ivory, tortoise shell, pearls, pigments, dyes (especially indigo), rice and various spices such as pepper, nard, malabathron as also some rare woods, some medicinal herbs and above all cotton and silk. It is highly likely that this trade began much earlier than is generally thought. The sea route between Egypt and India is said to have been charted by one Eudoxus Cyzicus, (during the reign of Eurgetes II (145-116 BC)), an Indian who was stranded on the shores of the Arab Gulf (Red Sea), and was brought to Alexandria. He did not know the local language, and therefore studied Greek there and gave the king information about sea route to India. Ptolemy is supposed to have sent two expeditions to India under Eudoxus, both of which made successful voyages and returned with a variety of goods.[33] He is said to have taken many gifts to India, and brought back in exchange aromatics and precious stones. What is more, he was again sent on another trip to India.[34]

A re-examination of the evidence of pottery and fresh excavation of Arikameḍu near Pondicherry which was an Indo-Roman trading station indicates that there were pre-Imperial Roman contacts in the 1st century BC or even earlier.[35] But if the sea route was charted in the 2nd century BC and successful voyages were made, why did the trade not flourish then? It has been observed that the Arab ships were not strong enough to withstand the monsoon gales, but Roman ships were much stronger and hence the trade received a tremendous boost in the Imperical period.[36] These ships would sail when the south-western monsoon was at its height, and hence they reached west coast of India much sooner. They would return in November when the north-west monsoon would be favourable.

The progress in trade was much slower than one would expect because the sea route was infested with pirates and the passage through the Red Sea was treacherous because of shoals. The trade received impetus when under Augustus, around 25 BC, the Romans carefully guarded the Red Sea, and an expedition was sent under Aelius Gallus to explore South Arabia and Ethiopia. The Romans then sent their naval fleet in the Red Sea. Along the route, Aden—ancient Eudaemon—was the only safe harbour between Suez and India. The contact became intimate and Augustus is said to have received many embassies from Indian states.[37] In course of time volume of trade increased gradually and, according to Strabo, instead of a few ships a year, about 120 ships began to sail to India, at the beginning of the Christian era.[38] There is sufficient evidence to indicate that Indians in good number started visiting Egypt in the Ptolemaic period from the third century BC onwards. Athenaues refers to the presence of Indian women, Indian cows and camels, and hunting dogs in the royal processions of Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt.[39] An Indian colony probably existed in Egypt even in the earlier period at Memphis where excavations have yielded some terracotta figu-

rines[40] which, from their physiognomy and costume, appear to be Indian. Some of them have been identified as representations of Pañchika, a Buddhist deity.[41]

Trade with Rome received a tremendous boost with the discovery of the monsoon by one Hippalus, a Greek sailor, in 44 AD and almost one ship is said to have sailed to India every day. All this trade was in India's favour. Pliny the Elder was sad for the loss the empire suffered every year because of the adverse balance of trade; as a result, the Romans had to pay in gold bullion to India. This amount, according to Senecea, was 300 million sesterces and Narcissus, 400 million. Pliny's lament that, ''This is the price we pay for our luxuries and our women,'' is no doubt justified. This trade is attested by archaeological evidence. Many Roman merchants had come to India and settled here. Some of them gave donations to Buddhist monastic establishments. Many of them hailed from a place called Dhenukākaṭa which has not yet been identified satisfactorily,[42] but may be Junnar.[43] One such merchant's house was found at Kolhāpur which yielded a hoard of exquisite bronze objects of Italian workmanship datable to the 1st century AD.[44]

The trade began to dwindle in the third century and was reduced to a trickle after a century or so. The memory of this trade still survives in Western India where the people in the coastal region worship a godess called Sakotari Mātā, who was named after Socotra, an island at the entrance of the Red Sea whence the treacherous journey to Egypt started.[45]

All this prosperity begins to decline from the third century onwards. The Sātavāhana rule comes to an end before the middle of the third century AD and the first casualty is the loss of political stability. The profitable trade with Rome also begins to dwindle because the Roman empire itself receives shattering blows. In a short period of time its locus shifts to the east of Constantinople. History repeats; the situation which prevailed around 2000 BC when the deurbanization of the Indus civilization starts, recurs again. The degeneration is so severe that there is no trace of material culture in the archaeological record of the post-Sātavāhana period. This again is not a local phenomenon because the situation in other parts of the country was not much different. Decline and decay are witnessed everywhere. R.S. Sharma has very meticulously analysed archaeological evidence from all over the country.[46] The evidence reveals that urban centres in North India suffered a sharp decline after the third century. At several sites like Sanghol, Hastināpur, Atranjikherā, Mathurā and many others there is a hiatus in the occupation, indicating that they were deserted after the Kashāṇa period only to be inhabited again in the Sultanate period. Even in the Gaṅgā plains during the Gupta epoch there is a marked trend towards decline as is clear from sites such as Śrāvastī, Kauśāmbī, Chirānd, Rājgir, Tāmluk and Śiśupālgarh.[47]

The same story repeats in Central India and the Deccan which formed the Sātavāhana territory. Most of the sites, as the excavated evidence indicates, were abandoned, after the third century. At sites like Paunī, Kauṇḍinyapur, Nāsik, Nevāsā, Ter, Bhokardan and Paiṭhaṇ, there is a break in occupation after the Sātavāhana period. The same happens in Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nāḍu.

The literary evidence too points to decline and degeneration and Yuan Chwang, that celebrated Chinese pilgrim, also testifies to it. R.S. Sharma rightly observes, "If congested constructions with drains, tools, refined pottery, sophisticated terracottas, granaries, coins, coin-moulds etc. indicate urbanism, their paucity or absence can legitimately be regarded as a symptom of the decay."[48] As the Roman trade dwindled, the industry declined, and probably there was not much internal trade worth the name if the evidence of coins is any indication. Many of the post-Sātavāhana dynasties in the Deccan did not issue coins. Europe, after the decline of the Roman empire in the fourth century AD, was passing through troubled times whereas West Asia witnessed the rise of Islam and consequent turmoil. This is precisely the period which witnessed crusades. The division of the Roman empire in two parts at the beginning of the fourth century AD and its eventual fall radically reduced the maritime trade passing through the Sātavāhana ports. Even the towns on the Silk Road in Bactria and Central Asia were on the decline. In fact everywhere in the Old World, the period from the 4th to 10th century AD is characterised by economic decline, and India was no exception to it.

It is therefore crystal clear that in the post-Sātavāhana epoch the economic activity was gradually coming to a grinding halt. Along with the cessation of foreign trade, colonization of new areas and consequent deforestation are also cited as a cause.[49] But another important cause seems to be the adverse environment. It appears that the environment which was congenial from the 4th century.BC began to deteriorate from the 4th century AD. In Europe there was an intensely cold climatic phase from the 4th to 9th centuries AD and if we accept the scientists' observation that when the temperate zone has an intensely cold climate, the tropical countries suffer drought, then we can infer that an arid phase set in after the Sātavāhana period. Exhaustive palaeoclimatic studies have been carried out in Europe based on the evidence of pollen grains, but we are sadly lacking such palynological evidence in India. Fortunately there is some evidence from our ancient literature which indicates that the period from the 4th to 9th century AD was marked by frequent droughts and famines. There is a heart-rending description of droughts in Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracharita* of the 7th-8th century AD.[50] The author narrates harrowing details of the famine in the city of Trigarta to which he seems to have been an eye-witness. We are told how there was no rain for almost twelve years and as a result crops withered, medicinal herbs lost their curative power

and trees bore no fruit; no religious rites and festivals were held and people had started eating each other. The same is probably reflected in the *Nārada Purāṇa* (Uttarārdha, Ch. 72, V. 24) in a story about the origin of the Godāvarī. The *Vāyu Purāṇa*[51] refers to a curse which made Vārānasī desolate, while the *Vāmana Purāṇa*[52] mentions that several holy places were suffering because of the advance of sand-dunes. The *Devī Bhāgavata* (XII.9, 1-37) describes a hundred years' famine. This famine was in all likelihood very widespread over a large part of Central and Western India and the Deccan as is corroborated by the *Javanese Chronicles* which relate that about 603 AD a ruler of Gujarat, warned of the coming destruction of his kingdom, bade good-bye to his son, and along with 5,000 followers, among whom were cultivators, artisans, writers, warriors, and physicians, sailed in six large and a hundred small vessels for Java where they laid the foundation of a great civilization.[53] This would show that a very important cause of the decline that set in the fourth century was the deterioration in climate. All this may be tantamount to ecological determinism, but we know what happens in times of droughts even in spite of sophisticated technology and increased communication in our own times. One can therefore just imagine what must have happened in the ancient past when man was at the mercy of the nature.

Notes and References

1. Lewis R. Binford, *An Archaeological Perspective*, New York, 1972 p. 20.
2. M.K. Dhavalikar, *First Farmers of the Deccan*, Pune, 1988.
3. D.D. Kosambi, "The beginning of Iron Age in India," *JESHO*, VI, 1963, pp. 309-18.
4. M.K. Dhavalikar, "An Ecological Model for the Chalcolithic Cultures of Central and Western India", *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 1984, pp. 133-58.
5. Colin Burgess, "Volcanoes, Catastrophe and the Global Crisis of Late Second Millennium BC", *Current Archaeology*, Vol. X, No. 117, 1989, pp. 325-29.
6. Karl W. Butzer, *Archaeology as Human Ecology*, Cambridge, 1982.
7. D.P. Agrawal, *Man and Environment in India through the Ages*, New Delhi, 1992.
8. Felix G. Sulman, *Short and Long Term Changes in Climate*, Boca Raton, Florida, 1982, p. 18.
9. G. Currie and R.W. Fairbridge, "Periodic 18.6 Year and Cyclic 11 Year induced Drought and Flood in Northeast China", *QSR, IV*, 1985, p. 111.
10. Reid A. Bryson and John E Ross, "Climatic Variations and Implications for World Food Production," *World Development, V*, 1977, p. 509.
11. H.H. Lamb *et al.*, "Drought and Decline of Mycenae", *Antiquity*, XIVII, 1974, p. 49.
12. H.H. Lamb, *Climate-Past, Present and Future*, II, London, 1977, pp. 424 ff.
13. Gilbert Walker, "On the Meteorological Evidence for the Supposed Changes in Climate

in India'', in *Long Range Forecasting of Monsoon Rainfall, Collected papers of Sir Gilbert Walker,* New Delhi, 1986, pp. 16-22.

14. John E. Kutzbach, ''The Changing Pulse of the Monsoons'', *Monsoon*, ed. by J.S. Fein and Pamela L. Stephen, 1987, p. 249.
15. Cyril Adred, *The Egyptians*, London, 1961, p. 8, Fig. 1.
16. Bruce A. Warren, ''Ancient and Mediaeval Records of the Monsoon Winds and Currents of the Indian Ocean'', *Monsoon*, eds. J.S. Fein and Pamela Stephens, New York, John Wiley, 1987, p. 142.
17. It is likely that Aśmaka included the Marāṭhwāḍā region of Maharashtra and at least some adjoining portion of the Telangānā region of Andhra Pradesh—Ed.
18. *The City in Early Historical India*, Simla, 1973.
19. J.C. Ray, ''Hindu Method of Manufacturing Spirit from Rice and its Scientific Explanation,'' *JASB*, 1906, pp. 130 ff.
20. Extant evidence justifies the dating of the Kshatrapa interegnum in the second-third quarters of the first century AD—Ed.
21. Lüders List, No. 1131.
22. *Ibid.*, No. 1137.
23. D.C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, Delhi, 1966, p. 26.
24. D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Calcutta, 1965, p. 169.
25 R.S. Sharma, ''A Survey of Land System in India from *c.* 200 BC to 600 AD'', *JBRS*, XLIV, 1958, pp. 225 f.
26. A coin of one Mahāraṭhi Vīraputa has been found in the excavations at Nevāsā.
27. S.B. Deo and R.S. Gupte, *Excavations at Bhokardan*, Nagpur-Aurangabad, 1974, pp. 88-90.
28. Moti Chandra, *Geographical and Economic Studies in the Mahābhārata*, -Upāyanaparva, Lucknow, 1945, p. 71.
29. R.C. Majumdar, *Classical Accounts of India*, Culcutta, 1906, p. 342.
30. Deo and Gupte, *op.cit.*, Pl. LVI, a-b, Figs. 37-39; for the complete specimen, see *Indian Archaeology, A Review*, 1973-74, p. 20.
31. These are in the site Museum at Ter.
32. E.H. Warmington, *The Commerce between Roman Empire and India*, Cambridge, 1928, pp. 198-99.
33. M.Rostowtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, II, Oxford, 1941, pp. 926-29.
34. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-84.
35. Vimala Begley ''Ceramic Evidence for Pre-Periphes Trade on the Indian Coasts'', in *Rome and India—Ancient Sea Trade*, ed. by Vimla Begley, R.D. de Puma, Wisconsin, 1991.

36. Lionel casson, "Ancient Naval Technology", in *ibid.*, pp. 8-11.
37. Warmingtom, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
38. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-84.
39. H.G. Rawlinson, *Intercourse between India and the Western World,* Cambridge, 1916, pp. 93-94.
40. Flinders Petrie, *Memphis,* London, 1909, I, pp. 16-17, Pl. XXXIX.
41. J.C. Harle "The Indian Terracottas from ancient Memphis: Are they really Indian?", *Dr. Debala Mitra* Festschrift, Delhi, 1991, pp. 55-61.
42. See D.D. Kosambi, "Dhenukākaṭa," *JAS,* N.S., XXX, 1955, pp. 166 ff.
43. Samuel C. Laeuschli, "Yavana Inscriptions of Western India," *ibid.,* LVI-LIX, 1981-84, pp. 207-21.
44. These were said to belong to the 2nd Century AD (*Lalit Kala,* No. 7, 1960, pp. 29-75), but are now assigned to the1st century AD. See R.D. de Puma, "Roman Bronzes from Kolhapur," in *Rome and India—Ancient Sea Trade,* pp. 82-112.
45. S.R. Rao, *Lothal—A Port Town, MASI,* 78, Vol. I, New Delhi, 1985, p. 224.
46. *Urban Decay (Ca. 300-1000),* Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1987.
47. M.K. Dhavalikar, "The Second Deurbanization", *The Indian Historical Review,* XVI, Nos. 1-2 (1990), pp. 211-i7.
48. R.S. Sharma, *op.cit.,* p. 122.
49. *Ibid.*
50. V.V. Mirashi, *Studies in Indology,* Nagpur, 1960, pp. 165-77.
51. D.R. Patil, *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa,* Delhi, 1973, reprint, pp. 32-30.
52. V.S. Agravala, *Vāmaṇa Purāṇa—A Study,* Varanasi, 1964, p. 9.
53. R.K. Mukerji, *Indian Shipping,* Bombay, 1957, p. 105 fn.

6

Sātavāhana : Sāta-Vāz and Vāja-Sāti

V.S. PATHAK

The ancientmost autochthonous dynasty ruling over the Deccan has been variously called Sātavāhana, Sādavāhana, Śalivāhana, and a little later Sālāhaṇa. The first part of the compound, *Sāta* or *Sada* recurs in the names of a few early rulers and in the cognomen of various later kings of the dynasty.[1] This gives rise to the assumption that *Sāta or Sada* was the original form and *Sali* or *Śali* were the dialectal variants. This is confirmed by the Prākṛit grammarians. Hemachandra devised a special rule for the change of Sātavāhaṇa to Sālavāhaṇa,[2] of which Śālivāhana and Sālivāhana were evidently the sanskritized forms. Here, we may draw attention to a parallel change of *Satiya* in Satiyaputa, the name of a South Indian dynasty which figures in Aśokan epigraphs, to *sāliyo*, as attested by the Latin transcription Cherlobothra, mentioned by Pliny.[3] That Sada-vāhana or Sāta-vāhana was the original form has been rendered certain by the contemporary epigraphic and numismatic evidence.[4]

The meaning and etymology of this word have become a veritable source of speculations and controversy for more than a milliennium. The folk etymologies, recorded in the works of Jina-prabha-sūri, Somadeva and Aḍiyārkkunallār,[5] the commentatoor of the *Silappadikāram*, respectively as 'one who has given (*sātāni)* vehicles'; 'one who has a *yaksha* by the name of Sāta as his vehicle,' and 'one who is devoted to the folk-deity Sattam,' may not be useful for grammar and semantics. A number of modern scholars, Przyluski,[6] Barnett,[7] Suniti Kumar Chatterji,[8] Kosambi,[9] Gopalachari,[10] Sarma,[11] Gairola[12] and others have suggested different etymologies. To add one more is to create a little more confusion. The justification for my doing so lies primarily in the fact that I have brought into the picture a new and important element, which may not only go a long way in the solution of this puzzle but may also offer clues to the kindred problems of linguistics and Sātavāhana history.

I had an occasion to point out that the language of the Sātavāhana records bears an unmistakable stamp of the Paiśāchī Prakrit with its two sub-varieties, the Chukhsa (now called the Gāndhārī Prakṛit) used by the Kshaharāta Kshatrapas of Taxila region heavily influenced by Iranian languages, and the Chūlikā, i.e. the dialects of Shan-Shan region and the adjoining area. Unlike scholars mentioned above, who took recourse to the Mundā the Draviḍian or the Sanskrit language for the derivation of the term, I am inclind to think that the name Sātavāhana, and many other words in Sātavāhana-Kshatrapa epigraphs and coins are Paiśāchī, and that their origin is to be sought in the *Chukhsa-Chūlika* ensemble. There is a definite evidence that the Sātavāhanas patronized the Prākṛit language and that Guṇāḍhya wrote his work in Paiśāchī.

First, we take up for consideration, *sāta,* the first part of the compounds Sāta-vāhana and Sāta-kaṇi. Of its different variants, we leave out *Śali* and *Sāli,* which are definitely later Sanskritized forms of *sāta,* and also *hāta* in Hāta-kaṇisha, which shows only a dialectal difference[13] due to the change of *sa* to *ha,* as in *hiru* and *Hāla.* However, we may include *Chāta* of Chāta-kaṇisha, the controversial reading on silver portrait coins of the Sātavāhana rulers.[14] The variant *Chāta* introduces a new element, as it is found also in the names of the Ikshvāku rulers of Andhra Pradesh in the fourth century AD, viz. *Chata-mūla, Chāta-mūla, Chaṁta-mūla, Chāta-siri and Chata-siri.*[15]

The variants of *sāta* may be divided into four classes—(a) *sata, sada,* (b) *sāta, sāda* (c) *chada, chāda,* and (d) *chaṁta.* The first two categories are differentiated on the basis of the short and long medial vowel a, whereas in the third category, the initial *sa* is changed to *cha.* Bagchi and Sircar tried to explain *sā* < *cha* in accordance with the rules of the Prākṛit grammar but failed to account for it satisfactorily.[16]

The change of *sa* to *cha* in Indian context is a lexical and not a phonetic problem, i.e. both the words, one with the initial *sa* and another with initial *cha* were borrowed by Indians from two different traditions—the Īrānian and the Śaka-Khotanese—though originally both words were connected.

Sāta/Sada is found in the Kharoshṭhī documents from the Chinese Turkestan as *Shad.* There it occurs both as a noun[17] and a verb[18]*Åshadosmi* and *shademi* 'I am pleased.' It belongs to the Īrānian tradition. In the *Avestā,* the word as verb is found in *Yasna* 51.8, *hvo zi māora syāto,* 'we shall indeed be happy with the spiritual word.' So also, it occurs in the Persepolis H. inscription of Xerxes, *siyāt ahanīy jīva,* 'I may be happy when living' (11. 46-47). In modern Persian *sād* means happy, but in the Sogdian Buddhist *s't* means the rich, prosperous. Its Śaka-Khotanese *tsāta* also conveys the sense of 'rich'. In the Khotanese text of *Suvarṇabhāsa* 53 n 4.5 occurs a phrase *saṁbāryan tsāta samartha* of which Sanskrit version is *prakaraṇasamṛiddha;*[19] here *tsāta*

is a synonym of the Khotanese *Samartha>samardha>samṛiddha*. The Śaka cognate is *chad* which is found in both the varieties of the Ossetic-Digoren and Iron.

Vāhana, the second part of the name, is as interesting as it is intriguing. Our investigation in the meaning of this word, however, may start from 'the traces of specifically Indo-Aryan speech' in the Near East. Some of the names of these 'Para-Indians' end with *vāz/vāj*. The famous Mitanni-Indisch prince Mattivāz nentioned in the Hittite inscriptions, and the noble man Sātavāja in the private records written in Assyrian are fair examples, the latter being of special interest to the present study. Vāz/vāj of the Para-Indians has a parallel in such Vedic names as Bharad-vāja. *Vāja* in the Vedic period means prize, booty or just wealth in general. *Vājasāti* is mentioned in various Ṛigvedic hymns :

पुत्रासो न पितरं वाजसातये महिष्ठं वाजसातये 1/130/1

In superlative as *Vāziṣta*, it occurs in the *Avestā*, where *vāz* seems to carry the connotation of value :

Vāzisto anhaiti astis

"He will become the most valuable helper."

To continue the story, we may refer to the reconstructed Bactrian form of the Kushāṇa king Vazeska as Oazesko (Henning, *ZDMG*, 1965, p. 84). Lastly, in the Khotanese documents we come across Visu-vāhaṁ as the name of a Khotanese king. *Vāha* from Avestan *Vāza* and skt. *vāja* means valuable (Bailey, *Khotan-Śaka Dictionary*, p.413 s. v. *ssau)*. It is interesting to note that the Sanskrit rendering of Visuvāham is Viśva-vāhana. This provides a clue to the meaning of *Vāhana* as a name-ending in *Sātavāhana*. I am, therefore, inclined to associate Sātavāhana with Sāta-vāz of the Para-Indians in the Near East, *Vājasāti* of the *Ṛigveda*, *Oazeski* or *Vāzeska* of the Bactrian language and *Vāhaṁ́* of the Khotan Śaka.

Notes and References

1. In names as Sātakaṇi on coins and the Hathigumphā inscription of Khāravela and in cognomens as Gautamiputa Sātakani, Vāisiṭhiputa Sātakaṇi etc.
2. अतसी-सातवाहने लः
   अनयोस्तस्य लो भवति। अलसी। सालाहणो सालवाहणो सालाहणी।
   Siddha-Haima Śabdānuśāsana, I. 211; *also-* स्वरस्योदात्ते। सालाहणो।
   I.8. The form *Sālāhaṇa* is comparable to Sātāhaṇa in *Sātāhaṇa-raṭṭhe* (Hirhadagalli CP inscription of Śiva-Skanda-varmman, D.C. *Sircar, Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization, I, 2nd edition*, 1965, pp. 461ff.

3. *Historia Naturalis,* VI, 104; also R.C. Majumdar *(Ed.), Classical Accounts of India,* pp. 310, 312.
4. Rāyā Simuka Sātavāhano, and *kumāra* Sātavahano in the Nāṇeghaṭ Cave Figure-label Inscription, *Select Inscriptions,* pp. 190-91; *Sātavāhana-kula-yasa-patiṭhāpanakarasa, ibid.,* p. 204; also in the legends on the coins of rulers, namely Sādavāhana and Chhimuka Sātavāhana.
5. For references see K.A. Nilakamth Sastri (ed.), *A Comprehensive History of India,* II, p. 299.
6. "Hippokoura et Sātakarṇi," *JRAS,* 1929, 274ff. *Sāta* from munda *sādam,* meaning horse.
7. *BSOAS,* IX, pp. 303ff. *Vahana* from Dravidian *magan* > *vagan.*
8. "Polyglottism in the Indo-Aryan," *Proceedings of the VII Oriental Conference,* p. 183; the *Calcutta Review,* Sept. 1936, p. 293. *Sāta* > *Śati* (horse) with *hotra* > *ghotra* > *ghoṭa* (horse).
9. "Development of *Gotra System,*" *P.K. Gode Commemoration Volume,* p.221. *Sāta* < *Sapti* (horse); *vāhana (*vehicle) *Sātavāhana* = the Sun.
10. *A Comprehensive History of India,* II, pp. 299-300.
11. *Coinage of the Sātavāhana Empire,* p. 3.
12. *ZDMG, CVI,* pp. 156ff.
13. Pischel, *The Comparative Prakrit Grammar,* Section 262.
14. S. Ramayya, *JNSI,* XXX, 1968, pp. 74-79. *Contra* D.C. Sircar, *EI,* XXXV, pp. 250-54; for other references about the controversy, see I.K. Sarma, *op. cit.,* pp. 113-22.
15. *EI,* XX, pp. 17 ff; p. 24 ff; XXI, p. 62.
16. P.C. Bagchi, "Śulilsa, Chūlila-Paiśāchi", *JDL,* XXI, 1931, p. 4; D.C. Sircar, *Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Deccan,* p. 17.
17. T. Burrow, *The Language of the Kharoshṭhi* Documents, p. 126.
18. *Ibid.,* p. 51. Note the Sanskrit verbal termination for the first person singular.
19. *Dictionary of Khotana-Śaka,* p. 146, *s.v. tsāta.* In the same text, *Kshemaścha bhavishyati* is translated as *tsāsta shaniāte,* "will become rich and get possessions".

7

Suitability of Paiṭhan as Capital of Sātavāhanas

D.N. SINHA

In the aftermath of the disintegration of the imperial Mauryan power, the Sātavāhanas steered political ascendancy in the Deccan with Paiṭhan as their capital. The era was characterized by aggressive expansionism due to high political ambitions of rulers and therefore the selection of the capital called for a very correct understanding of the external and internal environments and a meticulous and judicious application of political wit in exercising the choice. In choosing Paiṭhan as their capital, the Sātavāhanas appear to have shown political prudence of a very high order as it reveals, in its ultimate analysis, a very perfect appreciation of their state's requirements and the resources at their command. Looking back in the solid historical mirror, about two millennium years old, and with the help of still very limited availability of tangible and conclusive evidences, an attempt has been made to sketch out the possible reasons that might have played a decisive role in tilting the balance in favour of Paiṭhan as the Sātavāhana capital. The discussion is under three broad heads although very often the considerations overlap each other and therefore they cannot be compartmentalized with as much of simplicity as we have done here for our convenience of factual presentation.

(A) Geopolitical Considerations

Panikkar[1] has aptly pointed out that the overriding and governing fact of all political thinking in every country is its own security, its survival as a nation in which the unalterable geographical conditions play a commanding role. The Sātavāhana empire was located in an area almost separated by a natural or geographical barrier, in the form of intervening mountainous table-lnd, from the northern Gangetic basin where flowed the mainstream of imperialistic ambitions at that time. Any possible attack on the Sātavāhanas could have come only through a narrow pass on its north-west frontier

where prolonged hostilities are recorded with the contemporary contending power, the Śakas. There was no formidable enemy in the south and barring the north-west pass, the whole empire was secure from any northern attack as there is a marked absence of direct routes of communication between the north and the south, nor are there any rivers flowing from north to south and *vice versa* which could have provided water-way link for military movement. The point is exemplified by the naval march of Samudra Gupta for the southern conquest as part of this *digvijaya*.[2] The said march, we learn, proceeded along the eastern coast. The description of the *digvijaya* in the *Raghuvaṁśa* of Kālidāsa also emphasizes the same fact. Even the pilgrimage routes pass along the marginal areas. For these reasons perhaps, except for a very short period of Mauryan 5 way under the leadership of Aśoka, the Gangetic valley was not able at any time to establish its authority over this region on a secure footing. Even the imperial Guptas did not exercise effective authority here.

We have noted that in the south there was no formidable enemy, in the north the difficult mountainous terrain reduced the possibility of any large scale offensive, and in the east, the Bay of Bengal was the natural protection unless the enemy was equipped with a strong naval strength which was not there. Therefore the Sātavāhanas were committed to consolidate their military strength on the western side to defend their territory and on the other hand to secure command over the crucial sector of western ports for maritime trade.

It is in this context that the position of Paiṭhan acquires strategic importance. It was near the presumed battlefield for easy and effective control of war operations and yet a bit far from it to absorb any shock current arising out of fluctuating fortunes in the battlefield. Even the site proper is defended on three sides by the mighty Godāvarī river leaving requirement for more concentration of troops to one side only. To avoid residual risk due to its relative proximity with their greatest competitors, the Sātavāhana polity was heavily militarised as we note the appointment of military officers as provincial governors.[3] Further *kaṭaka and skandhāvāra*, terms used in their inscriptions, are supposed to be military camps and settlements which served as administrative centres.

When we glance at the alternatives to Paiṭhan from geopolitical angle, the names which come across our mind are Nāsik, Ter and the seaports like Kalyāṇa and Sopārā. The case of western seaports and Nāsik may be easily dismissed due to their vulnerability to hostile attack to which we have many references. The Śaka intrusion seems to be up to Nāsik as we have as many as six Śaka inscriptions in Nāsik cave No. 10.[4] Secondly, since the formidable Western Ghāṭs separated these regions from the remaining areas of the empire, there was liable to be a gap in communication which is a very essential imperative of unity and integrity of any empire.

So far as Ter is concerned, although it was a prosperous city of the Sātavāhanas, it appears that perhaps it developed during the Sātavāhana period and therefore it might not be a very important city at the time when Sātavāhanas were in the process of attaining power. At least at that time it was not important as to be considered for a capital town. The basis of this observation is rooted in the excavation conducted by the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute of Puṇe at Ter in 1958. The excavation[5] revealed that a considerable lapse of time intervened between the first phase of habitation (c. 200 BC to the end of 1st century BC) and the second and third phases of habitation (1st Century AD to 3rd Century AD). This observation is very significant because it indicates that Ter was a developing town during its first phase of occupation as it was relatively deserted after it, to be re-occupied after some time. That the city of Ter cannot be pre-Sātavāhana may also be inferred from the fact that punch-marked coins are not found there.

On the other hand Paiṭhan had well-established antecedents before the Sātavāhanas. Although the history of this area can be traced back to the Stone Age,[6] by the time of Buddha Paiṭhan had already become a thriving town with trade links with the south and north.[7] It finds a mention in the Buddhist as well as *Brāhamaṇical* literature. Even in the secular literature, Paiṭhan commanded such importance as to find mention in the ancient accounts of foreign writers like Pliny, Ptolemy and author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea;* grammarians like Pāṇini, and Patañjali and the epigraphic records like inscriptions at Kānherī[8] and Pitalkhorā.[9] The importance of Paiṭhan in the Mauryan period is also evidenced from its mention in Aśokan Rock Edicts V and XIII.[10] The word *Peṭenikā* mentioned in these edicts is supposed to refer to the inhabitants of Paiṭhan (details discussed later). Punch-marked coins are also reported from Paiṭhan.[11] All these facts go to show that Paiṭhan was a well-established centre to be considered favourably as the Sātavāhana capital.

(B) Economic Considerations

With the advent of the Christian era, we note a remarkable change in the nature of Indian economy from a predominantly agricultural to a largely commercial one with increased exchange liquidity or monetization of the economy. A natural corollary of this is the emergence of urban centres, the seats of trade and commerce which combine market activity with subsistence production. The increased surplus food production and monetized exchange intensified the process of urbanization. Thus we come across a number of towns or cities carrying out brisk commercial activities and consequently regular trade routes, which though present from earlier times, were now trodden with greater frequency. Further, the trade activities extended to far off places, specially the Roman empire. Much of the credit for it goes to Hippalus,[12] a venturesome navigator who observed the periodic

change of the Indian monsoon. This discovery, which is placed at about 45 AD opened a new oceanic route to Roman shipping and, what is more important, it freed the Roman empire from coastal piracy as well as Arabian monopoly of the eastern trade by tracing it to its source. Once this direct contact was established between the pockets of markets, the trade with Rome flourished like anything. Since the trade was largely sea borne, the significance of ports and its feeder continental trade routes attained new dimension for the Sātavāhanas. It is relevent to note here that the metals for minting Sātavāhana currency including lead and copper were chiefly an import commodity, being inadequately present in the indigenous natural resources. Therefore the Sātavāhana economy was dependent to a large extent on sea-borne trade and was not immune from the effects of naval blockade. Further, the Śakas, who were the contemporary contending power for control over western ports, were placed very near to it. They had already controlled Bharukachchha (Barygaza or Broach), one of the flourishing seaports on the west coast. In view of this the seat of political and military power of the Sātavāhanas too could not have been located far from the ports so that strategic reinforcement and command could be delivered to the zone of operation without much loss of time during transit and transportation. From the account of the *Periplus*[13] we know that the journey by the available means of conveyance at that time from Paiṭhan to Broach (Barygaza) took 20 days, the distance being 240 miles. It may be added here that this period of journey must be under normal circumstances of caravan movement and during war-time exigencies the transit time could have been significantly reduced, may be to the extent of fifty percent in which case Paiṭhan was only ten days away from the important port area of Broach.

Although lead for the coin-mints was imported from the West, the Sātavāhanas had to look for an indigenous source of this metal to avoid economic collapse in case the import gets stopped or reduced for any reason whatsoever, military blockade or adverse economy. We learn that the Zawar mines in Malwa region are rich and economically viable for lead and zinc occurring together as their sulphides namely galena (PBS) and sphalerite (ZNS) respectively[14] and that this area was economically exploited from quite an ancient period.[15] Some of the important by-products from these deposits are silver and gold also.[16] The Khetrī copper-mines of Rajasthan could also have been conveniently exploited for mints once Malwa comes under control. The copper and lead mining processes have, as their resultant scrap metal, the potin which was another popular medium of Sātavāhana currency. Analysis has shown that potin is an alloy of copper, zinc, lead and tin.[17] Thus control over the Malwa region could have ensured the supply of the medium of currency of bullion. Even otherwise, Malwa was a strategic point for gaining control over the Deccan from the northern and western parts of the country.[18] For this reason perhaps Sātavāhanas were very keen to gain control over Malwa and entered into conflict with the Śakas.[19] In the light of this competition for gaining supremacy over Malwa, again Paiṭhan gains significance as we

know that Paiṭhan was connected with Ujjayinī (Ujjain), perhaps the most important city of the region, by one of the arterial trade routes which would have been used for military march either purely for war or for providing escort to the moving caravan along the route.

Now let us analyse the importance of Paiṭhan in the movement of trade goods. Going by the account of the *Periplus*, Paiṭhan was important at least for two major trade goods—textile and carnelian.[20] The trading importance of Paiṭhan is also attested to by the contemporary epigraphical records as we note that a Pitalkhorā cave inscription of 2nd century BC refers to the merchants of Paiṭhan.[21] Further, the trade routes that connected major trade centres of South to those of the West and North India, passed through Paiṭhan or very close to it. On that account it was a very convenient place to control and monitor the trade movement of the empire. Above all, the city of Paiṭhan was traditionally important from the Maurỳan times as Aśoka is said to have sent missionaries for the residents of this area referred to by various names in Aśokan edicts. The Shāhbāzgarhī and Mānsehrā versions of R.E. V and Shābāzgarhī version of R.E. XIII call it *Pitinika*, the Girnār version of R.E. V calls it *Petenika* and the Kālasī version of the R.E. XIII calls it *Pitinikva*. The *Pitinikas*, Hultzsch[22] opines, were living in the western part of Aśokan empire or in Maharashtra as Raychaudhury[23] believes. Phonetically the word Paiṭhan sounds so similar to *Pitinika* that this region also might have been, as Woolner[24] suggests, the home of these *Pitinikas*.

To support standing army and the urban population engaged in tertiary sector of economy, surplus food produce was required. The main staple food of the kingdom was rice and it was grown abundantly in the Godāvarī basin area, notably the deltaic region, extending in the south up to the Kṛishṇā river basin. Therefore, to tap the agricultural produce and control its distribution, for which special responsibility rests with it, the capital town has to be located in the heartland of agricultural produce. At the same time it should also be near the distribution zone to reduce transport cost and to minimise the loss and inconvenience during transport. In the present case the major zone of produce was the Godāvarī delta area and the major zone of distribution was the western coast ports. In between the two, Paiṭhan occupies a pivotal position. Further, the river Godāvarī, on the bank of which Paiṭhan is situated, provided a very useful means of river-borne internal trade.

(C) Religio-Cultural Considerations

The Sātavāhanas rose to power in a period marked by Brāhmaṇical revivalism in socio-religious sphere. In the Deccan, the Sātavāhanas were the first indigenous dynasty to revive Vedic religion. Out of the newly acquired zeal or to exhibit their Brāhmaṇical inclination, they are recorded to have performed a number of Vedic

sacrifices. Sātakarṇi and his queen Nāganikā performed a number of sacrifices the description of which has been partly preserved in the mutilated inscription at Nāṇeghāṭ.[25] They seem to have celebrated no less than twenty sacrifices.[26] Aśhvamedha was twice performed, so also Gavāmayana. Some of the other sacrifices were Agnyadheya, Rājasūya, Āptoryāma and so forth. The same Nāṇeghāṭ inscription begins with adoration to Dharma, Indra, Saṅkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva, the sun and the moon and the four guardians of the quarters Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera and Vāsava. The performance of the Aśvamedha sacrifice is also evidenced by the presence of a clay Aśvamedha seal collected by Mangalam[27] of Deccan College, Pune. Towards this end we have numismatic evidence as well.[28] Various studies go to show, with varying degree of success, either their Śaivite or Vaishnavite inclinations. But one thing is certain that they were Brāhmaṇas and patronised Brāhmaṇical faith although they remained tolerant and very liberal towards the Buddhist or other faiths. In this light Kosambi[29] links the revival of Sanskṛit language and culture with the re-emergence of a special position for the Brāhmiṇa caste. The new system of ritual looked more imposing when chanted in Sanskṛit and in addition, since Sanskrit had been known to be spoken language of Āryans, its use lent the weight of antiquity of tradition to the new cults, observances and riturals which was of great significance for a society as conservative as the Indian when it comes to acceptance, by the general society, of any change.

In the light of Brahmaṇic inclinations of the Sātavāhana dynasty, the bank of the Godāvarī river where Paiṭhan is situated attains special significance as the river is regarded very holy sanctified by the Vedic and Purāṇic literature. Therefore Paiṭhan had attained the status of *Dakshinakāśī*.

The *Sutta-nipāta*[30] refers to a Brāhmaṇa from *Sāvathi* (Śravastī of Kosala) named Bāvari living on the banks of the Godāvarī in Assaka's territory. He is said to have dispatched his sixteen Brāhmaṇa disciples to Buddha who probably proceeded via Patiṭṭhāna (Paiṭhan) to Ujjain, Vidisā, Kosambī, Sāketa, Sāvatthī, Kapilavastu Kuśīnārā, Pāvā and Vaiśalī. In addition to this example, the Brāhmaṇas from the north had accompained the caravaners as far as the Godāvarī river even before the Buddhists.[31] Since in ancient times the pilgrimage routes very often coincided with the trade routes, we are inclined to believe that Paiṭhan was frequently visited by these Brāhmaṇas as it had direct communication with the northern trade and religious centres extending through Ujjain to Kauśāmbī and as far as Pāṭaliputra in the east. To agree with the rising tide of Brāhmaṇism, the Sātavāhanas might have intended to choose a place which Brāhmaṇas had perferred to frequently visit and perhaps settle also, learning to assimilate the local cults but at the same time engaging themselves in the traditional Vedic and Upanishadic observances and rituals.

Thinking about Ter as an alternative, from this angle we notice that it had more

Buddhist influence than Paiṭhan as noticed by the apsidal temple and antiquities related to Buddhism recovered from Ter on a large scale. The *triratna* symbol on pottery also reveals the prevalence of Buddhism in the society.[32] Added to it, we do not have any significant brāhmaṇical find which shows the predominant and almost exclusive control of Buddhism here. Perhaps for this reason, the city could not survive in the phase of Brāhmaṇic upsurgence because the very base of adaptation, in the form of alternative religious stream, for a city was lacking here and ultimately the city collapsed to nothingness. Since there was no brāhmaṇical base at Ter, it was ignored by the Sātavāhanas as the capital of a brāhmaṇical dynasty.

From the above facts and analysis it is clear that the choice of Paiṭhan as capital of Sātavāhanas was guided by certain imperatives and factors that were very correctly understood by the Sātavāhana rulers. The above analysis is placed before the learned scholars on the assumption that Paiṭhan continued to be the Sātavāhana capital perhaps till the end.[33]

Notes and References

1. K.M. Pannikar, *Geographical Factors in Indian History*, Bombay, 1959, p. 115.
2. R.C. Majumdar, *Ancient India*, Delhi, 1982, p. 231.
3. R.S. Sharma, *Aspects of Political Ideas and Insitutions in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1968, p. 211.
4. *IA*, XLVII, 1918, p. 73.
5. B.N. Chapekar, *Report on the Excavation at Ter*, Poona, 1969, pp. IV and 18
6. H.D. Sankalia, *Pre-History and Proto-History of India and Pakistan*, Bombay, 1962, p. 140.
7. B.G. Gokhale, *Buddhism In Maharashtra*, Bombay, 1976, p. 7.
8. *JABBRAS*, V, 1853, p. 27, no. 13, pl. 19; V, 1861, p. 3, no. 5; *ASWI*, IV, p. 61 and *EI*, X, Lüders List, No. 988.
9. *ASWI*, IV, pp. 83-84; *AI*, No. 15, p. 72.
10. E. Hultzsch, *CII*, I, Oxford, 1925, pp. 8, 44, 55, 67 and 74.
11. Syed Yusuf, *Paithan Excavations*, Reprinted from *Indian Art and Letters*, XII, No. 2, p. 9 & Pl. XIII a.
12. C. Margabandhu, *Archaeology of the Sātavāhana-Kshatrapa Times*, Delhi, 1985, p. 196.
13. W.H. Schoff (Tr.), *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, New York, 1912, p. 196.
14. K.V.G.K. Gokhale and T.C. Rao, *Ore Deposits of India—Their Distribution and Processing*, Delhi, 1973, p. 87.
15. D.P. Agrawal, *Copper Bronze Age in India*, Delhi, 1975, p. 156.
16. Gokhale and Rao, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

17. I.K. Sarma, *Coinage of the Sātavāhana Empire*, Delhi, 1980, p. 56.
18. O.H.K. Spate, *India and Pakistan*, London, 1954, p. 148; Panikkar, *op.cit.*, p. 40.
19. Moti Chandra, *Sārthavāha* (Hindi), Patna, 1953, p. 98.
20. Schoff, *op.cit.*, pp. 196 and 43.
21. *AI*, No. 15, p. 72.
22. S. Bhattacharya, *Select Aśokan Epigraphs*, Calcutta, 1960, p.15.
23. H.C. Raychaudhury, *Political History of Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1953, p. 259.
24. A.C. Woolner, *Text and Glossary*, Vol. II, Calcutta, 1924, p. 113.
25. *ASWI*, V, pp. 60-61,
26. *IA*, XLVIII, 1919, pp. 77-78.
27. P. Sitapati (Ed.), *Sātavāhana Seminar*, Hyderabad, 1981, p. 6.
28. I.K. Sarma, *op.cit.*, p. 68.
29. D.D. Kosambi, *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay, 1985, p. 279.
30. F. Max Müller (Ed.), *The Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. X, Part-II, Oxford, 1881, p. 184.
31. D.D. Kosambi, *op.cit.*, p. 269.
32. Chapekar, *op.cit.*, p. v.
33. It may be pointed out that though tradition regards Pratishṭhāna as the Sātavāhana capital, extant archaeological evidence indicates that the first Sātavāhana capital was somewhere in the Telaṅgānā region of Andhra Pradesh and the first capital in Maharashtra was most probably Junnar in Puṇe district. It was probably during the closing years of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi or early in his son and successor Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi's reign that the capital was finally moved to Pratishṭhāna and the posterity naturally remembered it as the dynastic capital—Ed.

8

The Sātavāhanas and the Coastal Āndhradeśa : A Chronological Study

V. SUNDARA RAMA SASTRY

I

The history of the Sātavāhanas, right from their name and identity, as well as their original home and chronology, not to speak of the individual reigns of the kings, constitutes a subject of unending debates. Relying extensively on the Purāṇas and a few epigraphical records of Sātavāhanas, the history of the dynasty had been studied in the past, with no agreement on the problems among scholars. Several scholars from Andhra Pradesh used to seriously argue that the Sātavāhanas hailed from coastal Andhra, the plains around the mouth of the river Kṛishṇā and their capital was Dhānyakaṭaka-Amarāvatī, ever since the dynasty rose to power. However, scholars from other parts of the country used to contend the view equally seriously.

The numismatic discoveries at Kōṭaliṅgāla in recent times, with the coins of Chhimuka among them, have set the controversy at rest. It can now be confidently pointed out that the region of Gōdāvarī plains of modern Karīmnagar district, which was perhaps a part of ancient *janapada* of Aśmaka, was the original home of the Sātavāhanas.[1] Ajay Mitra Shastri[2] has clearly established the fact that the coins of Sati Siri, Sadakaṇi, Sādavāhana and others obtained during the excavations at Sātānikōṭa in Kurnool district show the Sātavāhana connection with the plateauic region in the western part of Andhra Pradesh, since the inception of their rule. But how and when the Sātavāhanas extended their power to the coastal strip of the state is a matter that deserves some more study. The present attempt is to present some ideas on the expansion of the Sātavāhana power against a wider background of the study of the Sātavāhana chronology.

The Purāṇas supply lists of kings, their individual regnal periods and the total duration of the rule of the family, whom they refer to as the Andhras or Andhrabhṛityas.[3]

But the statements vary from one Purāṇa to another and one manuscript to another of the same Purāṇa. The *Matsyapurāna* is supposed to be more faithful in this respect, but different manuscripts of the text give the number of Andhra kings variously as 19, 21 and 28. However, the Purāṇa completes the account with a statement that 19 kings would rule the earth for 460 years.[4] Different manuscripts of *Vāyupurāṇa* give variously the number of Andhra kings as 17, 18, 19 and 25; give some names of kings with individual regnal years, but complete the account[5] with the statement that 30 kings would rule the earth for 456 years. Similarly various manuscripts of the *Vishṇupurāṇa* give 22, 23 and 24 names of kings in the dynasty and their regnal years, but close the account stating that 30 kings would rule the earth for 456 years.[6] The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* states[7] that 30 kings would rule the earth, but gives only 21 names. The *Bhavishyapurāṇa* gives the list with 21 names of kings and states that 30 kings would rule the earth.[8] The *Bhavishyottarapurāṇa* gives the names of 34 kings and their regnal periods and finally states that 32 kings would rule the earth for 500 years.[9] Thus the Purāṇas give not only a confused but also a self-contradictory account for the Sātavāhana history.

The problem of the Sātavāhana genealogy and chronology becomes still more puzzling, as we find that most of the names of the kings obtained from different Purāṇic lists are not the same. Again, the names known from the Purāṇic lists are not always supported by the epigraphic and numismatic evidence. Only a few kings of the dynasty, known from the Purāṇic evidence are also known from the inscriptions and coins as well. Some names obtained from the latter sources are not found in the Purāṇic lists. Hence, a commonly agreeable list of kings, supported both by the Purāṇas and inscriptions and coins, has not been possible.

But the Purāṇas in the midst of the widely divergent statements are unanimous on one point. It is that the Andhras (or the Sātavāhanas) would rise to power after assassinating the last of the Kāṇva kings, Śuśarman, and exterminating the remnants of the Śuṅgas.

The most baffling problem in fixing the Sātavāhana chronology is the date of the commencement of the Sātavāhana rule. Some scholars believe that there were 30 kings in the dynasty as the Purāṇas report and that they ruled for 456 years. Another school considers the unanimous statement of the Purāṇas as to the rise of the dynasty to power after the Kāṇvas as the more important than the divergent statements about the names and number of the kings as well as the total length of the dynastic rule. As such, the Mauryan imperialism having ended about 187 BC followed by the rule of the Śuṅgas for 112 years and that of the Kāṇvas for 45 years, the rise of the Sātavāhanas is fixed at 30 BC. They adopt a shorter list of kings and fix the lower limit of the Sātavāhana chronology about the end of the first quarter of the third century AD. R.G.

Bhandarkar,[10] H.C. Raychaudhuri[11] and D.C. Sircar[12] were important among the protagonists of this school.

V.V. Mirashi,[13] M. Rama Rao[14] and others, on the other hand, believed that 30 kings of the Andhras ruled for 456 years and thus fixed the rise of the Sātavāhanas about 225 BC. They opined that the Mauryan imperialism would have declined about the year, following the death of Aśoka and the Sātavāhanas would not have given up the opportunity to proclaim their independence. They pointed out that the shorter list of kings found in some manuscripts of *Vāyupurāṇa*, which was the basis for the former school, states that it was reporting only the prominent (*prādhānyatah pravakshyāmi)* and not the entire list of the Sātavāhana kings. These arguments rest on the support of the date of Nāṇeghāṭ inscription of Nāganikā, as fixed by Bühler.[15] on palaeographic grounds in about the first half of the second century BC, to a time close to the Aśōkan edicts. But the scholars of this school conveniently overlook that Bühler himself had also suggested that the record has to be assigned to a time, not more than a century earlier than the Nāsik inscription of Gautamī Balaśrī, dated in the 19th regnal year of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi.

The latter school claims that the stratigraphic evidence obtained during the excavations at Neṿāsā[16] would support the theory that the Sātavāhanas began their rule in the last quarter of the third century BC and that the dynasty ruled for 456 years. Ajay Mitra Shastri[17] has exploded the logic in using the Sātavāhana coins, first to date the culture phase of the excavation and again dating the coins on the basis of the stratigraphical evidence to the culture phase. Scholars generally overlook, in this context, that there is the possibility of artefacts of small weights, such as the coins seeping into deeper layers due to natural factors such as rains. Thus the stratigraphic evidence is not absolutely reliable at all times.

Thus, there appears no reason in depending solely on the Purāṇic evidence to determine the Sātavāhana chronology and trying to substantiate it, by means of archaeological data, often manoeuvred as required. It would be better to exclude altogether some of the kings in the lists, whose names are not substantiated either by epigraphical or numismatic evidence. Again, a few others, whose existence is substantiated by inscriptions and coins, too, apparently belonged to some collateral lines and they must have ruled over some small principalities. At least a few kings who have neither inscriptions nor coins in support of their rule are simply fictitious. Even their names sound and mean peculiar.

II

The right way to arrange the Sātavāhana chronology is to work out the Khāravēla-Sātakarṇi and Śaka-Sātavāhana synchronisms and including only those Sātavāhana

kings, who are known from the epigraphic and numismatic evidence alone, as members in the main line of the dynasty. Hitherto the synchronisms were worked out by scholars, but on the assumption that the Sātavāhana chronology was a settled matter, according to their own favourite standpoints.

The Khāravēla-Sātakarṇi Synchronism

The Hathigumphā inscription of Khāravēla says that the king sent in his second regnal year, a formidable army consisting of elephants, chariots, horses and infantry, to the dominions of Sātakarṇi, unmindful of the latter's power and greatness;[18] and that the army touched Kaṇhabeṇṇā and threatened the city of Musika (or, Asika, according to V.V. Mirashi[19]) with destruction.

Scholars so far, unanimously, take the Sātakarṇi, who is referred to in the Hathigumphā inscription as identical with Sātkarṇi I.[19a] They substantiate their conclusion for two reasons. First is that the Hathigumphā inscription was assigned to the beginning of 2nd century BC[20] to which time the Nāṇeghāṭ inscription also belongs. The record supposedly referring to the 165th year of the Muriya-kāla and the year 103 of Nandarāja was meant to be dated to the first half of the second century BC. But these are by no means settled readings and the interpretations of the inscription as these chronograms are not acceptable.[21] The second is that Sātakarṇi I was described in the Nāṇeghāṭ inscription[22] as *Dakshiṇāpathapati* and was a performer of an *aśvamedha*. As such rivalry between the two expansionists was supposed to be quite natural. R.D. Banerji and K.P. Jayaswal[23] added a few more points to the argument, that most other kings among Sātavāhanas, named Sātakarṇi, were distinguished by their metronymics, but the one who was the husband of Nāganikā alone is known as Sātakarṇi only. Further, they supposed that no other king of the name, except Sātakarṇi I, had, apparently, any connection with Kaliṅga, or with its ruler, as epigraphical or numismatic evidence would suggest.

But these points made by the learned scholars are too feeble to force the identification of Sātakarṇi. Firstly, epigraphists now-a-days scarcely depend on palaeographical features to precisely date inscriptions.[24] Especially, when the inscriptions are separated by long distances, they cannot be palaeographically compared for any reasonable conclusions. Secondly, the metronymics borne by the Sātavāhana kings appear only from Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and no early king in the dynasty held them.[24a] It has been shown[25] that the metronymics held by several kings in a number of dynasties of the Deccan during the second and third centuries of the Christian era were to proclaim their elevated social status and that they were not parts of their personal names. The omission of such epithet in the inscription issued by a rival king like Khāravēla cannot

be a strong point in identifying Sātakarṇi. After all, Khāravēla cannot be expected to report the name of his adversary faithfully, especially in an inscription intended to proclaim his own power and prowess against him. The Jūnāgadh inscription of Rudradāman I also mentions the Sātavāhana king, twice defeated by the Śaka king, simply as Sātakarṇi, but on that ground he cannot be identified with Sātakarṇi I, as in the case of Hathigumphā inscription, simply because no metronymic epithet was applied to his name. Thirdly, there is no epigraphical or numismatic evidence that would suggest their connection with Kaliṅga, including those of Sātakarṇi I. As such, there is no reason to think that Sātakarṇi I alone could have any relation with the country of Kaliṅga and its ruler.

In order to identify the Sātakarṇi, the rival of Khāravēla, it is necessary to keep in mind the cause of their conflict. Even in the absence of a direct or tangible source of information, the cause of the conflict appears to have been their mutual bid to push their power into Maisolia, or the Mahisha country. There is reason to believe that the country was situated around the mouths of the river Kṛishṇā[26] which seems to have been occupied by such peoples as the Aruva, Erumai and others, who seem to have attained a high degree of civilization by that time. Some of them appear to have been carrying on maritime trade with South-East Asian countries. The fertility of the soil and the commercial prosperity of the country of Maisolia must have attracted the expansionists, the Aira king Khāravela from Kaliṅga and Sātavāhana king Sātakarṇi from Aśmakā and Mūlaka *janapadas*. The Hathigumphā inscription mentions, apart from the expansionist expedition on the dominions of Sātakarṇi, that Khāravēla, in the 11th year of his reign, destroyed the city of Pithuṁḍa, which was built by Avarāja[27] in the past, and got the area tilled by means of ploughs yoked to donkeys. The record further says that the king shattered a confederacy of Tramira kings, which was a source of trouble for the past one hundred and thirteen years. The Tramira kings were rightly taken to be Draviḍa kings by the editors of the record. But the kings would not have been Pāṇḍya, Chera and Chola kings of ancient Tamiḻagam, whose realms were quite far away from Kaliṅga and Khāravela could have no trouble from them, to nurse enmity for them. Ostensibly, the Tamil kings mentiond by the Hathigumphā inscription must be the chiefs of the Aruva, Erumai and others, who were the inhabitants of the region of Maisolia. The ancient Tamil literature of the Saṅgam period indicates that these peoples were speakers of Koḍundamil, or a corrupt Tamil dialect, which came to be basic linguistic strata of the Telugu language. The silver portrait type coins of the Sātavahānas from Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi onwards contain legends, apart from the Prākṛit, in this corrupt Tamil, which was the root of later-day Telugu.

The victory of Khāravela over the Tramira kings must have been his second

attempt to annex the territory and to terrorize the peoples. The first was certainly his earlier expedition on the realms of Sātakarṇi, who was perhaps successful in annexing the territories earlier than the Aira king. Ptolemy states in his *Geography*[28] that a people called Aruournoi were living in the region of Maisolia, who must be the same as the Aruvas of the ancient Tamil literature. Ptolemy further mentions that the capital of the people was Pytimdra, which was an important inland emporium. Scholars are almost unanmious[29] in identifying Pithuṁḍa of the Hathigumphā inscription with the Pytimdra of the Ptolemy's account. Scholars tried to relate the term *avarāja* of the Hathigumphā inscription with the kings of Ava in Burmā,[30] but the term must be a misspelling for Aruvarāja. Tha Ava kings of Burmā could hardly be taken to have built the town of Pytimdra on the east coast of peninsular India. Ptolemy wrote his *Geography* about 140 AD and thus the city was flourishing as a centre of foreign trade as late as the middle of the second century AD. As such, the Sātakarṇi of the Hathigumphā inscription cannot be identified with Sātakarṇi I, in which case the city would have been destroyed about the second century BC, or at least towards the close of the first century BC. In such a case Ptolemy could not have mentioned it. Hence Sātakarṇi, the adversary of Khāravēla, must be taken to be identical with someone of the name in the dynasty, who ruled about 140 AD.

The Śaka-Sātavāhana Synchronism

The Nāsik inscription of the 19th regnal year of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi, better known as the Nāsik *praśasti* of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, which was issued by the latter's mother Gautamī Bālaśrī, refers, for the first time, to the Sātavāhana relations with the Kshaharātas and Śakas.[31] The Junāgaḍh inscription of the western Kshatrapa king Rudradāman I avers that he twice defeated Sātakarṇi, who was *Dakshiṇāpathapati*, but left him unmolested, because of his close relationship with him.[32] The Junāgaḍh inscription was issued in the year 150 AD.[32a]

The *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, written about 80 AD,[33] states that Calliena (Kalyāṇa) "in the time of the elder Saraganus became a lawful market town, but since it came into possession of Sanders, the port is much obstructed and Greek ships boarding there, may chance to be taken to Barygaza under guard." It mentions that Mambanus was the ruler at Ozene,[33a] who is generally identified with Nahapāna. Though the identification is disputed by some scholars, the Śaka-Kashatrapa rule over the region of Ozene or Ujjain at the time is beyond any doubt. Saraganus in this statement was obviously, the Greek corruption of Sātakarṇi, who might be identical with Sātakarṇi I, for his coins are discovered over a wider area than Deccan, including Mālwā, Surāshṭra and other regions. No wonder, such territories were lost by the Sātavāhanas during the rule of the weak rulers after Sātakarṇi I, and Śakas took

possession of the territories and the maritime trade that was being carried on through the ports such as Bharukachchha. The author of the *Periplus* must have noted that situation of the Sātavāhana ports and maritime trade, overwhelmed by the Śaka predominance. Some scholars identify Sanders with Sundara Sātakarṇi[34] of the Purāṇic lists of the Sātavāhana kings, but there is no evidence to believe that there was ever a king of the name among them in the absence of epigraphical and numismatic data.[35]

According to his own Junnar inscription, Nahapāna[36] is known to have ruled for at least 46 years. His coins with his portrait are discovered all over Mālwā, Gujarat, Kāṭhiāwāḍ as well as Aparānta. Inscriptions of his son-in-law, Ushavadāta (Ṛishabhadatta) are found in Nāsik caves, dated by latest in the year 45.[37] D.C. Sircar and V.V. Mirashi[38] rightly took the years mentioned in the inscriptions of the Kshaharātas as Śaka dates. The Andhau inscriptions[39] have proved that the Kshaharātas dated their inscriptions in Śaka era. Thus, the year 46 of the Junnar cave inscription of Nahapāna corresponds to AD 124. Another Nāsik cave inscription, of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, issued in his 18th regnal year,[40] reports that a land previously belonging to Ushavadāta was donated by him to the Buddhist *vihāra* at the place. The Jogalthembī hoard brought to notice some thousands of coins, previously issued by Nahapāna and restruck by Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, perhaps, in consequence of his astounding victory over the Kshaharāta ruler. In other words, the Sātavahāna king, Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, killed Nahapāna and exterminated his rule, as the Nāsik *Praśasti* describes the king. The event must have taken place in his 18th regnal year, which must have corresponded to the 46th regnal year of Nahapāna, equivalent to AD 124.[40a] As such, Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi must have ascended throne in AD 106. The king is known to have ruled for 24 years, as he had issued another Nāsik inscription in that year.[41]

The Jūnagaḍh inscription of Rudradāman is dated in the year 72, which corresponds to AD 150. Sātakarṇi, the contemporary of the Śaka king, whom the latter twice defeated and left unmolested, was perhaps, Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi. He was one of the sons of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and succeeded Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi. Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi followed his father Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, and the Purāṇas assign him 28 years of rule and inscriptional evidence supports it. Hence his period of rule may be placed between AD 130, the last regnal year of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, and the year AD 158, when he was followed by his younger brother Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi. Ptolemy[42] gives contemporaneity of the king Puḷumāvi with Tiastenes of Ozene, who is identified with Chashṭana. Chashṭana was succeeded by Rudradāman, who overpowered the Sātavāhanas and got Vāsishṭiputra Sātakaṇi married to a Kārdamaka princess. She issued an inscription, dated in the 13th regnal year of the king.[43] As such, his reign can be dated to AD 158-71.

III

There is no difficulty in arranging the regnal periods of the last members of the dynasty, as the Purāṇic evidence generally corroborates with inscriptional or numismatic evidence in most cases. But in such cases, as of the early members in the dynasty, where there is no such agreement between the epigraphical and numismatic material and the Purāṇas, the chronolgoy may be finalized by according credence to the former sources of knowledge, rather than the latter, in a general way.

The Purānas mention Simuka (or Sindhuka or Śiśuka) as the founder of the Andhra (or the Sātavāhana) line of kings and give him a rule 23 years. The Nāṇeghāṭ relievo inscriptions name him as *Rāya Simuka Sātavāhanō Sirimatō*[44] and the Kōṭalingāla coins include his issues, with his name inscribed as 'Chhimuka'. There need be no doubt as to the identity of Simuka and Chhimuka, against the wide divergence among the Purāṇas in reporting his name. Hence his historicity need not be doubted.

But when did the Andhra king Simuka proclaim independence? With the Purāṇic reports of 30 Sātavāhana kings to have ruled for 456 years having been rejected, there remains only the shorter list of the kings. The unanimous statement of the Purāṇa texts that the Andhras emerged independent with the extermination of the Kāṇvas and remaining Śuṅgas, indicates that the former were ruling contemporaneously with some scions of the Śuṅgas, who were still holding power over certain areas. Perhaps, R.G. Bhandarkar was right in taking the Kāṇvas, the later Suṅgas, and the Sātavāhana king Simuka as contemporaries. Hence Simuka may be taken to have founded the imdependent Andhra kingdom in 73 BC and ruled for 23 years as Purāṇas report, till 50 BC.

The Purāṇas generally name Kṛishṇa as the brother and successor of Simuka and that he ruled for 10 years.[44a] A Nāsik inscription[45] names the king Kaṇha, who belonged to the *Sātavāhana-kula.* Scholars identify the king with Kṛishṇa of the Purāṇic accounts.

The next king in Purāṇic lists is Sātakarṇi, who is mentioned as the son of Simuka.[45a] One of the Nāṇeghāṭ relievo inscriptions reads: *Dēvī Nāyanikāya Raño cha siri Sātakanino.*[46] The longer Nāneghāt inscription issued by Nāgānikā (or Nāyanikā) apparently describes his greatness, as the king was *Dakshiṇāpathapti* and a performer of two *aśvamedhas,* one *rājasūya* as well as a number and variety of Vedic rituals. *Dakshiṇāpatha* seems to stand for the ancient *janapadas* of Anūpa, Aśmakā and Mūlaka with the adjoining regions up to the Kṛishṇā valley in the south and was perhaps so called as the routes to south India passed through the region. A large number of coins with the named ''Sadakani'' and ''Sātakarni'' are obtained from Kotaliṅgālā, Dhūlikaṭṭa and Peddabaṅkūr in the Karīmnagar district; Koṇḍāpūr in Meḍak district and Sātanikoṭa in Kurnool district. This area corresponds to Dakshiṇāpatha and thus coins can be attributed to the king with least doubt. The king appears to be a conqueror and

empire-builder as suggested by the wide distribution of his coinage and performance of two *aśvamēdhas*, but the Purāṇic literature assigns him only 18 years of rule. As such, it is tempting to suggest that the king might be identical with the so-called Sātakarṇi II, for whom the Purāṇas unanimously assign 56 years of rule. An inscription on the southern gateway of the Sāñchī stūpa refers to a king Sātakarṇi[47] and a large number of coins are also found all over Mālwā, Surāshṭra and Cutch, with Ujjain symbol and the name Sātakarṇi inscribed on them. If the Sātakarṇi of these inscriptions and coins is taken to be identical with the king of the same name, who was son of Simuka and husband of Nāganikā, the evidence points out that he must have had a long victorious career as a great conqueror and empire builder. He may also be identified with Sātakarni II and his performance of the two *aśvamēdhas* would also be justified in the light of these achievements.

Following Sātakarṇi, the Purāṇas give some names of kings like Pūrṇotsaṅga and Skandasthambi, who are not known from any other source, especially from either epigraphical or numismatic. On the other hand, there are coins of kings by names Sati Siri and Sadavāhana (or Sātavāhana), discovered at several places all over the Deccan plateau, almost along with those of Sātakarṇi. There is good reason to suppose that the queen Nāganikā issued her longer inscription during the reign of one of her sons. The relievo inscriptions name some *kumāras* or princes, such as Haku Siri, Sātavāhana and another, whose name is much obliterated. Ostensibly the princes must have been the sons of the queen and Sātakarṇi. Haku Siri is taken as identical with Sati Siri (or Śaktiśrī) of the coins[48] who might have followed Sātakarṇi on the Sātavāhana throne. Sādavāhana is also known from the coins apart from the relievo inscription. He might have succeeded either Sātakarṇi, his father or his brother, Sati Siri. But it is quite surprising to note that these kings could not find place in the Purāṇic lists, but the Sātavāhana genealogy and chronolgoy have to provide them places. There appears no strong reason to identify any of these kings, either with Pūrṇotsaṅga or Skandasthambi, who might have belonged to some collateral line, if not altogether fictitious, but the Purāṇic writers might have included them in the Sātavāhana line erroneously.

Following Pūrṇōtsaṅga and Skandasthambi, the Purāṇic lists unanimously name another Sātakarṇi, as to have ruled for 56 years. Hence it appears imperative to consider him as a historical person, unlike the names of the kings and the lists before and after him. The *Yugapurāṇa* mentions that a Sātakarṇi defeated and expelled Śakas,[49] when they invaded Kaliṅga. Some scholars in the past, who took the Purāṇic lists of thirty kings as the inviolable evidence for the Sātavāhana kings, treated this king as distinct from Sātakarṇi, the son of Simuka. It has been suggested above in these pages that probably this king may have been identical with Sātakarṇi I, son of Simuka. But there are some coins issued by a king called Kauśikīputra Sātakarṇi, who does not

find mention in the Purāṇas, but whose coins resemble the issues of the early Sātavāhana kings.[50] Some scholars identify this king with Sātakarṇi II of the Purāṇic lists. In such a case, he might be the same, who was referred to in the Sāñchi inscription, and the coins from Mālwā and Surāshṭra, with the legend Sātakarṇi, may also be attributed to him. It may also be suggested that Suśarman, the Kāṇva king, would have been defeated and slain by this king, if not by Simuka, in the light of the Sātavāhana expansion into the Mālwā-Vidiśā region. He must have been the founder of the Sātavāhana imperialism, in whose reign the empire could have marked the widest extent, for the first time.

All the Purāṇas present identical lists of the Andhra (or the Sātavāhana) kings from Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi. The predecessor of the king, Śivasvāti, is also mentioned in most of the Purāṇic lists and his regnal duration as 28 years is also unanimously stated. As such, his historicity may be conceded, though there is no supporting epigraphical or numismatic evidence. The kings following Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi are known either from the inscriptional or numismatic sources and in most cases from both. Hence there need not be any doubt about the historicity of the kings from Śivasvāti to the last king in the line, Chaṇḍa Siri or Puḷumāvi IV.

Of the kings in the Purāṇic lists between Sātakarṇi II and Śivasvāti, a few kings are known from literary traditions, and one king, Āpīlaka, is known from a solitary coin obtained from the Chhattīsgarh region of Madhya Pradesh. He must have been a member of a local branch that could have ruled over the region, and could not have been a member of the line which ruled from Paiṭhaṇ. Kuntala Sātakarṇi and Hāla are two kings, who figure in the Purāṇic lists and celebrated in literary traditions, but no epigraphical or numismatic evidence comes forth to prove their historicity. It is yet to be determined if these were not nicknames. If not, they could have been members of collateral branches of Kuntala and Andhra regions. The name of the former smacks of the possibility of the association with the Kuntala country, while the latter, who is famous as the compiler of the anthology, *Saptaśatī*, must have association with the Telugu speaking country, as the work betrays strong influence of Telugu on its Prākṛit dialect. Except these three kings, the remaining names can hardly be taken as the names of any historical personality.

It has to be noted in this context that the coins discovered at Peddabankūr in the Karīmnagar district, belonging to Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi, bear the devices closely related to those found on the coins of the early Sātavāhanas, such as Sātakarṇi and Sātavāhana.[52] Hence scholars[53] in recent researches found that not a long interval can be postulated between the two groups of the Sātavāhana kings, which fact was pointed out by Bühler on palaeographical study of the Sātavāhana

inscriptions. As such, the kings in the Purāṇic lists of the Andhra kings, between Sātakarṇi I or II and Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, expect Śivasvāti, cannot be accoommodated in a single line, as to have ruled from Paiṭhan.

The Sātavāhana chronology following Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi can be more confidently worked out by means of the synchronisms discused above. It is now clear that the Śaka predominance in Surāshṭra and Aparānta drove the Sātavāhanas towards the coastal plains of the eastern Deccan. The earliest evidence that speaks of the Sātavāhana connection with the coastal plains of Andhradēśa are the coins of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi, discovered at a number of places in coastal districts of Andhra Pradesh. Besides, a coin-mould of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi[54] was discovered at Vijayapurī, near Śrīparvata-Nāgārjunakoṇḍa. The discovery points out the possibility of the site being a Sātavāhana mint at least from the time of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and that the king established his authority over the coastal plains of eastern Deccan, in other words, the coastal districts of the modern Andhra Pradesh.. The Nāsik *praśasti* of the king mentions the mountains as to have spread over his empire, which are identified with the Eastern Ghāṭs, the Mahēndra mountains and their offshoots.

At the time when the Sātavāhanas began inroads into the coastal Andhradeśa, during the early centuries of the Christian era, the country around the mouth of the river Kṛishṇā, or the region of Maisolia, was occupied by a number of peoples, such as the Mahishas or the Eṟumais, the Yakshas, the Aruvas and the Nāgas, besides many others. Most of them were trading communities, carrying on a flourishing seaborne trade with South-East Asain countries. In order to take these trading peoples and their territories into their hegemony, the Airas or the Mahāmeghavāhanas, who were the same as the ''Sadas'', were trying for a long period of one hundred and thirteen years before Khāravēla. The Sātavāhanas also began to extend their supremacy over these areas, aiming at reaping the benefits of the maritime trade from the east coast. Especially when their power over the west coast was lost to the Śakas who deprived them of the benefits of the trade, they must have made a determined bid to conquer and control the east coast. They strongly contested with the Sada-Mahāmēghavāhana power in this enterprise and perhaps Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi must have accomplished the conquest. The description of his empire in the Nāsik *praśasti* indicates the point. The Aira-Sadas were obviously overpowered in these conflicts, but the hostilities seem to have persisted. In order to avenge this discomfiture, Khāravela must have sent an army over the dominions of Sātakarṇi, who was none other than Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi. The style of description of the persontality and accomplishments of Khāravela in his Hathigumphā inscription was seemingly intended to outwit the description of the Sātavāhana king in the Nasik *praśasti*. But Khāravela must have been completely suppressed by the Sātavāhanas, perhaps, by the successors of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi.

An inscription of Vāsiṣhṭhīputra Puḷumāvī among the epigraphs discovered from Amarāvati and coins of the king found at a number of places in coastal Andhra show that he was able to maintain the Sātavāhana hegemony over the region against the Aira-Sada pressure.[55]

But the king Sātakarṇi, who was the adversary of Khāravela, was most likely Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi. He was the Dakhināpathapati, twice defeated and spared by Rudradāman I as he was perhaps married to a Śaka-Kārdamaka princess. He seems to have conducted wars with the Śakas as well as with the Aira-Sadas, on behalf of his elder brother and king, Vāsishṭhiputra Puḷumāvi. Subsequently he followed the latter on the Sātavāhana throne and finally subdued the Airas about the 14th regnal year of Khāravela, after the latter had put up his Hāthigumphā inscription. It is doubtful whether Khāravela mentioned the name Sātakarṇi in his inscription being fully aware of the name of the reigning Sātavāhana king, or just used it as a synonym of the term Sātavāhana. In such a case the statement in the Hāthigumphā inscription has to be understood only to mean that Khāravēla sent his armies on the Sātavāhana dominions and not specifically on the dominions of a king called Sātakarṇi.

RESUME

The foregoing analysis makes it clear that the Sātavāhanas rose to power in central Deccan, in the territories now included in the western parts of modern Andhra Pradesh, in the upper Gōdāvarī valley. From the beginning of their rule, their power extended into the Kṛishṇa valley in the south and continued till the end of their rule. In the initial stages of their political career, they were interested in extending their power into Koṅkaṇ and Aparānta in the west, as the regions were cradles of flourishing maritime trade. Gradually they could register the expansion of their power over Mālwā and Surāshṭra as well, as the country prospered economically. When the Śaka predominance deprived them of the commercially prosperous territories on the west coast, they began to push their imperial authority into eastern Deccan, towards the east coast, from the time of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi. They had a long-drawn conflict with the Aira-Sadas in this bid, but they were finally successful in establishing their supremacy over the east coast, not only of the modern Andhra Pradesh but also of modern Tamil Nadu. The coins of Gautamīputra Yajña Sātakarṇi, with the symbol of the double-masted ship discovered in south as far as Cuddalore, substantiate the view that the Sātavāhana imperialism in the east coast extended up to the Kāvērī plains.

Now, the Sātavāhana chronology may be arranged tentatively in the light of these observations as given below :

	Name of the king	*Regnal Period*	
		Purāṇic information	*Historically probable*
1.	Simuka Sātavāhana	23 Years	73 BC - 50 BC
2.	Kaṇha (or Kṛishṇa) Sātavāhana	10 Years[56]	50 BC - 40 BC
3.	Sātakarṇi I	18 Years	40 BC - 22 BC
4.	Successors of Sātakarṇi I, viz. Sati Siri and Sātavāhana	43 Years	22 BC - AD 20
5.	Sātakarṇi II	56 Years	20-78 AD
6.	Śivasvāti	28 Years	78-106 AD
7.	Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi	21 Years[57]	106-130 AD
8.	Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi	28 Years	130-158 AD
9.	Vāsishṭhīputra Sātakarṇi	19 Years[58]	158-171 AD
10.	Śivaśiri Puḷumāvi	7 Years	171-178 AD
11.	Gautamīputra Yajña Sātakarṇi	29 Years	178-208 AD
12.	Vijaya Sātakarṇi	6 Years	208-214 AD
13.	Caḍa Siri (or Candra or Daṇḍa)	10 Years	214-224 AD

Notes and References

1. Discovery of coins of Chhimuka, the founder of the Sātavāhana power, definitely points out the possibility of the dynasty starting its rule in the Central Deccan, on the plains of Godāvarī, now included in Andhra Pradesh.
2. *EHD PP*, Delhi 1987, pp. 1-12.
3. Earlier historians supposed that some Purāṇas mention the kings by the name Andhrabhṛitya as well. But we find only the terms Andhra and Andhrajātiya in the Purānic statements on the Sātavāhana kings, when they speak of the end of the Kāṇva rule and foundation of power by Simuka. Hence, the view that the Purāṇas called the kings seemingly the subordinates of the Maurayas as Andhrabhṛitya is an unwarranted interpretation of the Purāṇic statements. Actually the Purāṇas employ this name to the vassals of the Andhra-Satavāhanas who became independent later—Ed.
4. *Kāṇvāyanaṁs-tatō bhūpaḥ Suśarmāṇaṁ prasahya taṁ*
   Śuṁgānāṁhesch-aiva Yachch eshaṁ kshapitvā tu
   balīyāsaḥ Sikśukō-ndhraḥ sajātīyaḥ

prāpsyat-īmāṁ vasundharāṁ; and
Ekōnaviṁśatir-hy-ete
Andhrā bhokshyanti vai mahīṁ; tesham varsha śatānisyus-chatvāri shashṭiri-ēva cha.

5. *Kaṇvāyanam-ath=odhṛitya Suśarmāṇaṁ prosahya tāṁ kshapayitvā balaṁ tadā*
Śuṅgamam ch-āpi yach-chhishṭaṁ
Sindhukō hy-Andhrajātīyaḥ prāpsyat-īmāṁ vasundharāṁ;
and Ity-ete vai nṛipās-triṁśad=Andhrā bhōkshyanti yē mahīm
samāḥ śatāni chatvāri pañchāśad vai tath-aiva cha

6. *Suśarmāṇaṁ tu Kāṇvaṁ tad=bhṛityo Balipuchchhaka nāmā hatv-Āndhrajātīyō vasuḍhāṁ bhokshyati; and Evam-ete triṁśachhatvāry-abda-śatāni shat-pañchāśad-adhikāni pṛithvīṁ bhokshyanti.*

7. *Kāṇvāyanam-ath-odhṛitya Suśarmāṇaṁ Prasahya taṁ*
Sindhukō hy-Andhrajātīyaḥ prāpsyat-īmāṁ vasundharāṁ; and
Ity-ete vai niṛpās-triṁsad=Andhrā bhokshyanti ye mahīṁ
samāḥ śatāni chatvāri pañcha-saḍ-vai-tath-aiva cha.

8. *Hatvā Kāṇaṁ Suśarmāṇaṁ tad-bhrtyō vṛishalo Balī gāṁ bhōkshyaty-Andhrajātīyaḥ kañchit-kālam-asattamaḥ... and Ete triṁseīhanripatasyaś-chatvāry-abda-śatāni cha ṣhat-pañchāśach-cha pṛithvīṁ & bhokshyanti...*

9. This gives clear idea about the difference in the Purāṇic texts and their utter unreliability in the Sātavāhana studies.
10. *Early History of Deccan*, pp. 58 ff.
11. *Political History of Ancient India.* p. 403.
12. *History and Culture of Indian People* (hereafter *HCIP*), II: *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 192.
13. HISWK, pp. 2-9.
14. "Studies in the Early History of Āndhradēśā", *Madras University Journal*, XXXVII, Nos. 1 and 2, pp. 9-12.
15. *ASWI*, IV, p. 73.
16. B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao, *The Age of Sātavāhanas*, Hyderabad, 1976, p. 14.
17. *EHD* PP, 6-12.
18. *EI*, XX, p. 79, Text-line 4 :, *Dutiya cha vase achitayitā Sātakaṇiṁ pachhima-disaṁ haya-gaja-nara-ratha-bahulaṁ daṁḍaṁ paṭhāpayati kanhabeṁṇā-gatāya cha senāya vitāsiti Musikanagaraṁ...*
19. *HISWK*, p. 26, text-line 1.
19a. Some scholars identify him with Sātakarni II also—Ed.
20. *EI*, XX, p. 74; *HISWK*, p. 91 ff.
21. D.C. Sircar, *HCIP*, II : *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 215, Note 1 and *EHD PP*, p. 4 and notes 18 and 19.

22. The Nāṇeghāṭ inscription of Nāganikā, text-line 2, says that the king performed *aśvamēdha*. But some scholars suggested recently that the preamble of the inscription speaks of the achievements of Simuka, the father and predecessor of Sātakarṇi and thus the horse-sacrifice has to be credited to him. The suggestion cannot be easily brushed aside. As the stone on which the passage under reference is engraved is badly damaged, the text is not available in the accurate form.
23. *EI*, XX, p. 74.
24. A.M. Shastri, *EHD PP*, p. 5.
24a. The fact is that we have no well preserved earlier record and one cannot be sure on this pointed-Ed.
25. V.S.R. Sastry, "Social Significance of Metronymic Epithets in Early Indian Ruling Dynasties: A Study''. *PIHC*, 51 Session, pp. 115ff.
26. V.S.R., Sastry, ''Further Thoughts on Aira-Sadas'', *PAPHC*, XVII, pp. 115ff.
27. *EI*, XX, text-line 11, *Avarāja-nivesitaṁ Pithuṁdaṁ gadabha-naṁgalena kāsayati janapada-bhāvanaṁcha terasa vasa-satikaṁ ābhiṁdati Tramiradesha saṁghātaṁ...*
28. A. Cunningham, *Ancient Geography of India*, p. 454 and D.C. Sircar, *HCIP*, II : *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 226.
29. For example, A.S. Altekar, *EI*, XX, pp. 84-85.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Text-line5, *Saka Yavana Palhava nisūdanasa* and line 6, *Khakharāta-vasa-nir-avasēsa-karasa...*
32. Text-line 12. *Dakṣiṇāpathapateḥ-Sātakarṇeṛ-dvirapi nirvyājam-avajity-āvjitya sambamdh-āvidūratayā an-utsādanāt prāpta-yaśasa...*
32a. This is the date of the bursting of the Sudarśana dam and not of the inscription which must have been put up a few years later—Ed.
33. Quoted by D.C. Sircar, *HCIP*, II : *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 199.
33a. The *periplus* does not associate Manbanus with ozene, but with Ariake or Larike-Ed.
34. B.S.L. Hanumantharao, *The Age of Sātavāhanas*, p. 24. Saraganes is identified with Sātakarṇi II, who does not seem to be different from Sātakaṛni, the son of Simuka, *vide infra.*
35. V.V. Mirashi also rejected the historicity of Sundara Sātakaṛni.
36. *HISWK*, p. 133ff.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 113 and *EI*, X, Lüders List, No. 1174.
38. *HISWK*, pp. 64-73; D.C. Sircar, *HCIP*, II, pp. 200-202.
The other view is that these are his regnal years—Ed.
39. *HISWK*, pp. 116 ff. The Andhau insciptions, however, belong to Chashṭana who was not a Kshaharāta—Ed.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 27. Text-line 6; *Savachhare 10 8 Vasapakkhaṁ 2 divase 1.*
40a. These equations cannot be taken for granted as there could have been some gap between

the two sets of dates. There is also no certainty about Nahāpanā's years being of the śaka era—Ed.

41. *Ibid.*, pp. 34 ff.
42. Quoted by D.C. Sircar, *HCIP*, II : *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 202.
43. *HISWK*, p. 62 ff. Purāṇas assign him a reign of 19 years, but on the basis of the epigraphical evidence, it is reasonable to assign 13 years of reign to the king.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

44a. Eighteen years according to some Purānas—Ed.

45. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

45a. This is the opinion of the modern scholars as against the unanimous Purāṇic tradition that he was Kṛishṇa's son—Ed.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
48. For an analysis of the epigraphical and numismatic evidence on the historicity of these princes, see A.M. Shastri, *EHD PP*, pp. 16ff.
49. R.D. Banerjee and K.P. Jayaswal, *(EI*, XX, pp. 76-77) took these events described in the *Yugapurāṇa* as historically true.
50. V.V. Mirashi, *JNSI*, XIII, Pt. ii, pp. 133-34.
51. P.L. Gupta, *Coinage of Sātavāhanas and Coins from Excavations*, Ed. Ajay Mitra Shastri, Nagpur 1972, p. 136.
52. M. Rama Rao, *Sātavāvahana Coins in the Andhra Prdesh Government Museum*, Hyderabad.
53. "Purāṇic Sequence of Sātavāhana Kings Vis-a-Vis the Evidence of Satavāhana Coin-Types", paper presented in the seminar, by Amiteshwar Jha, Nasik. *Vide infra* paper no. 18.
54. The mould has been shown to be of the reverse of the silver portrait coin of Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi—Ed.
55. For a detailed discussion on these points, see the author's paper in the *PAPHC*, XVII, pp. 23 ff. The author has proposed the possibility of the Aira-Sada rule over coastal Andhra, as a sequel of the Khāravēla's invasion, before the Kaliṅga king was overpowered by the Sātavāhanas. Subsequently P.R.K. Prasad had developed the theory of the existence of the Sada line of kings who ruled over the coastal Andhradeśa. He has worked out a genealogy and chronology of the kings, but the present author does not concur with the learned scholar (*PAPHC*, XVII). The Sada-Sātavāhana relations as discussed in these pages will make it clear that it was not the Sadas, who held the political power over coastal Andhradeśa, but a number of self-governing peoples, who were carrying on trade and commerce and occupying the territory. Both the Sadas and Sātavāhanas made inroads into the territory, with varying success, and finally the Sātavāhanas were able to annex the region into their hegemony. Prasad's views that the lion device on the coins of the Sadas was brought by them from Kaliṅga, and that it was carried on by the Sātavāhanas as well, and that the Sadas were thus a pre-Sātavāhana dynasty make a confusing reading. The

symbol was not brought by the Sadas from Kalinga, at the first instance, and is found on some early coins from Amarāvatī, which he regards as even earlier than the Sada coins. Hence, these coin-issues and the lion device are not of much use in the context of deciding the political succession of the dynasties and lines of kings. The lion symbol is to be taken as a totem, respected by whichever dynasty held power over the coastal Andhra, right from the pre-Sada times to the Vishṇukuṇḍin times. But the Hathigumphā inscription of Khāravela, as explained in these pages, and the Guṇṭupalli inscription of Siri Sada and Vēlpūru inscription of Mahā Sada would indicate the Aira-Sada rule over the region, while the Sātavāhana rule over the same region is equally clear. The conflict between the two powers over a commercially prosperous country is quite natural. For the Velpūru inscription of Mahāsada, *vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri's paper in JESI, XIX, pp. 13-19.

56. 18 years according to some Purāṇas—Ed.

57. Inscriptional evidence indicates that he ruled at least for 24 years—Ed.

58. 29 years according to *Vāyu* mss. which is the sole source of our informtion about him—Ed.

9

The Sātavāhanas and the Chaṅkam Age

RAJU KALIDOS

I

The Sātavāhanas are assigned to a vast span of time from the middle of the 3rd century BC[1] to the beginning of the 3rd century AD (Sastri 1966: 92). They hailed from Pratishthānapura (modern Paiṭhan) in the heart of Western India, the abode of Indian rock-cut cave temples, and held command over the entire Dakshiṇāpatha at the peak of their imperial career, excepting the far South, region beyond the Tirupati hills, occasionally peeping into Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. Also called Andhras and Andhrabhṛityas[2] (Gopalachari 1976: 24), the later kings alone at the dawn of the Christian era extended their sway over the Coromandel coast. The Chaṅkam[3] age is supposed to fall within bounds of the first two centuries of the Christian era (Basham 1971: 463). A huge corpus of literature in fine Tamil is attributed to this epoch of excellence, rightly called the Augustan Age (Kanakasabhai 1966: 3; Smith 1962: 463). Antique traditions, recorded in later works like the *Iṛaiyaṇār Akapporuḷ Urai* (*c.* 7th-9th centuries AD) talk of three Chaṅkams, extending over about 10,000 years and patronised by 197 Pāṇḍya kings. Obviously, the veracity of these figures demands intensive scrutiny, being fictitious. But at the same time, certain other historical evidences demand re-examination if a plausible date for the genesis of Chaṅkam is to be proposed. Even these references are vague and serve no good purpose to solve the problem once for all. In the wake of the problem taken up for examination in the present article, ''The Sātavāhanas and the Chaṅkam Age'', it is indispensable to find out at least a working hypothesis.

The earliest Tamil works, appearing in any written record, are found in the *Bible* which refers to *kapim* (T. *Kavi*=monkey) and *tukim* (T. *tōkai*=peacock or its plumage) as items of import by King Solomon from Thar, shish, the Tamil country.[4] It points out the commercial intercourse between the East and West, the origins of which are

shrouded in historical mist. So, it may be taken for granted that items of food and luxury were exported to the Semitic and Mediterranean countries from at least 1,000 BC. This may explain the presence of certain Tamil-based words like *tuki* (T. *tōkai*), *ahalim* (T. *akil*, a perfume) and oryza (T. *arichi=rice)* in Greek. Eminent linguists like Caldwell (1956) and Chatterji (1965) have spent their energies fruitfully in an effort to remove the veil, hovering the antiquity of Tamil. An organised polity at the dawn of the Christian era was not produced by magic but by centuries of spadework, dating back to the times of the Old Testament of the *Bible*.

Quasi-historical evidences are forthcoming from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* which note the earliest North-South contact. These centre around the myths such as (1) Arjuna taking the hand of a Pāṇḍya princess, (2) the reference to Kavāṭa[5] (Kapāṭapuram?), the seat of mythical First Chaṅkam, celebrated in *Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ Urai*, and (3) Paraśurāma as godfather of traditional Kerala. It may also be noted here that Peruñchoṟ-ṟutiyañ Chēralātaṉ of *Patiṟṟuppattu* is supposed to have fed the flanks fighting at Kurukshetra, site of the great Bhārata war (*Chilampu*. XXIX, v. 24). Lack of corroborative evidences would render invalid the historical factors behind these statements , but the fact that by about the 7th-6th century BC the Tamils had an interaction with the North is beyond question. The Āryan torch-bearer, sage Agastya, marching into the South Indian plains is an allegorical pointer to the Āryan-Drāviḍian[6] syncretism in cultural affairs. More tangible evidences are supplied by the *Arthaśāstra* (II, ch. 76) of Kauṭilya and the Edicts (Rocks Nos. II & XIII) of Aśoka. Kauṭilya's phrase, *Pāṇḍyakavāṭa* (Sastri 1972: 12) (cf. Varāhamihira's *Pāṇḍyavāṭa),*[7] is a reference to the Pāṇḍyan pearl after which the Romans were crazy. Aśoka's rock edicts mention the Pāṇḍya, Chōḷa, Keraḷaputra and Satyaputra as his next-door neighbours with whom friendly and diplomatic relations existed, resulting in the inflow of Buddhist-Jain missionaries. Another evidence is the reference to a confederacy of Tamil states (*Tamiradeśaśaṅghāta)* in the Hathigumphā inscription of Khāravela which is said to have existed in the 3rd century BC[8] (*EI*, XX: 71-89). Besides these external evidences, the short Tamil-Brāhmī inscriptions in natural caverns attest the kind of cultural activities from about the 2nd century BC. These Jain ascetics (e.g. vajranandis) are celebrated literati of the age,[9] which means literary pursuits (Raman 1977: 263-65) were busy by about the time of Aśoka.

Scholars like Subrahmanian (1980: 22, 25-34) are inclined to bring a vast corpus of literature[10] within the framework of the Chaṅkam Age. But recent research has given credence to the dating of Tamil works like *Chilappatikāram, Maṇimēkalai* and *Patiṉeṇkīḻkkaṇakku* by scholars like S. Vaiyapuri Pillai (1956) to a post-5th century AD time-bracket. Even among the integral works of *Pattuppāṭṭu* and *Eṭṭuttokai,* few such as *Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai* and *Paripāṭal* are assignable to dates, posterior to the 4th century

AD. For example, the *Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai* shows unmistakable influence of Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava* in dealing with the birth of Murukaṉ (Kumāra or Skanda). (Kalidos 1992: ch. I) Kamil Zvelebil's (1981) works are notable in this conext.

The scholarly fashion is to talk in term of an 'Age' *vis-a-vis* a group of literature, i.e. Chankam, which in fact crosses the bounds of 200 AD. even if the *Tolkāppiyam*, *Pattuppāṭṭu* and *Eṭṭuttokai* alone are taken into account. In fact, an academy of poets is likely to have existed.[11] It could not by any means be confined to the early centuries of the Christian era since the *Paripāṭal* and *Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai* are later works. Similarly, the *Tolkāppiyam* (*tol* means 'antique') is said to have been improved upon (Basham 1971: 464) down to the 5th century AD, and its earliest phase of composition may go back to 300 BC. Several of the poems in the *Pattuppāṭṭu* and *Eṭṭuttokai* collections, especially *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and *Akanāṉūṟu*, are likely to be as old as 300 BC. (cf. Subrahmanian 1980 : 11). This hypothesis would allow us a case for the contemporaneity of few of the Chaṅkam works with the inscriptions of Aśoka and Khāravela, their references to Tamil and the Tamil kings.

Relying upon the data forthcoming from sources alien to Tamil, certain generalisations could be arrived at. They are: (1) The Tamils by about 300 BC were organised enough though internally fighting among themselves, they had the farsightedness to integrate their forces on occasions of need, especially threat from outside (e.g. Khāravela's reference to the Tamil confederacy)[12] so that Aśoka (Edicts II & XIII) could solicit their cooperation for a peaceful coexistence. (2) An organised society in which the luxuries (e.g. pearls and perfumes) and items of food (e.g. rice) were exported. This is to prove self-sufficiency in food production and existence of organised guilds, marketing artistic ornaments and objects. Thus, commercial contacts were established with countries, nearer home and abroad. (3) Matrimonial (e.g. Arjuna marrying a Pāṇḍya princess) and diplomatic relations (Aśoka's Buddhist missionaries, and a Chrēra king providing food to fighters in the Bhārata war, a hint at the proverbial hospitality of the Tamils). (4) Occasional skirmishes that took place between the Tamils and the northern states (e.g. reference to the Mauryan as intruder into the Tamil country).[13]

Forging their sovereign powers into a confederacy, the ancient Tamil rulers were masters of the land-mass from Vēṅkaṭam (Tirupati hills) in the north to Kanyākumārī in the south. Literature from the remote past[14] to the 5th century AD[15] bears witness in this regard. The absence of Aśoka's edicts in the far South, beyond the Tirupati range, would support this notion. Besides the crowned kings of the land, the triarchy coonsisting of Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa-Chēra, there was a number of minor potentates, notable among them being the Vēḷirs of Koṅku, Kōchar, Nalliyakkōṭaṉ (hero of Chiṟupāṇāṟṟuppaṭai, ruling the region around Māmallapuram) and the seven great philanthropists, called *kaṭaiyēḻuvaḷḷal* (viz. Pāri of Paṟampu, Ōri of Koḷḷi hills, Kāri or Malaiyamāṉ of Kōvalūr, Atiyamāṉ

[Satyaputras] of Takaṭūr, Pēkaṉ of Nallūr, Āy of Āykuṭi and Naḷḷi of Naḷḷi region in the Pāṇḍya country).

If on hypothetical grounds, the Chaṅkam is pushed to 300 BC which is highly probable, it goes without saying that the age is contemporaneous with the Sātavāhanas. But it is perplexing to find that in the entire Chaṅkam works, including the twin-epics *(Chilappatikāram* and *Maṇimēkalai)*, nothing specific about the Sātavāhanas is found. It is mysterious because the Nandas and Mauryas[16] are noted. The *Maṇimekalai* (XIX, 11, 107-8) refers to skilled artists from Magadha, Marāṭha and Yavana (i.e. the Hellas).[17] The *Chilappatikāram* (v. 11.99-104) with reference to greatness of Karikāla-Chōḷa mentions the prizes he received from the rulers of Vajra (*koṟṟappantar,* a pearl-pavilion for audience), Magadha (*paṭṭimaṇṭapam,* an ornate pavilion), Avanti (*tōraṇavāyil*='arched gateway') and so on. These evidences would guide us to conclude that the Sātavāhanas should have had some interaction with the Tamils. And how was this? It is the question which takes us to the second part of the paper.

II

The learned scholar, V. Kanakasabhai (1985-91), made the pioneering attempt to link the Sātavāhanas with Tamil historical tradition. He picked out useful notes from the *Chilappatikāram* in this daring venture. These pertain to Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar, Puṟampaṇaiyāṉ and Pāchaṇṭachchāttaṉ. In the Kāḷkōṭkātai of the *Chilampu* (XXVI, 1.149) the Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar are mentined as neighbours of the Chēras who volunteered to assist Cheṅkuṭṭuvaṉ in his efforts to bring a stone from the Himālayas to make an image of the Goddess of Chastity (Kalidos 1993: 68-106). Kanakasabhai breaks the word, Nūṟṟuvarkuṉṉar, into two, i.e. *nūṟu* and *kaṉṉar*, and equates them with *śata* 'hundred' and *karṇa* 'ear' making out Śatakarṇi and not Sātakarṇi (*infra* fn. 21). In another context, the *Chilampu* (IX, 11.9-21, 60) refers to a number of *kōṭṭam-s* 'temples' which existed in Pukār, the emporium of the Chōḷas.[18] Among them are Puṟampaṇaiyāṉ and Pāchaṇṭachchāttaṉ, supposed to be one and the same,[19] and Kanakasabhai suggests that it was temple for Śatavāhana.[20] As earlier pointed out Gopalachari has dismissed both these identifications. The second one seems to be highly controversial but the first (Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar=Śatakarṇi) somewhat substantial. Basing on the synchronism of Cheṅkūṭṭuvaṉ-Gajabhāhu-Sātakarṇi (latter half of the 2nd century AD) the equivocation of Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar with Sātakarṇi[21] is probable. But the date of the *Chilampu* is a point in consideration. If a literature of the 5th century AD, Iḷaṅko's identification could only be tentative, even if probable. Obviously, he should have based his version on some oral account in vogue in those times.[22] Again, that word Sātavāhana[23] (not Śatavāhana) is more frequently used in inscriptions. But even this issue is debatable according to some authorities (cf. fn.21-23).[24] So, there seems to be some valid ground

for the association of Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar with Sātakarṇi as Kanakasabhai has very ingeniously suggested. This would establish the fact that there should have been some interaction between the Sātavāhanas and the Chaṅkam monarchs who from their inception to sovereignhood down to dismemberment were contemporaries.

If the clues provided by the *Chilampu* (XXVI, 11. 146-55) in its *Kāḷkōṭkātai* could be further elaborated, it may be understood that the Sātavāhanas provided some liaison service to the Chēras in their efforts to bring a stone from the North. The text suggests that the Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar came forward to bring the stone itself on behalf of the Chēras. Then, the story elaborates into an expedition to the North by Cheṇuṭṭuvaṉ via the Nīlgiris, interview given to the Koṅkaṇa-*kūttar* (bards of Koṅkaṇa), Karunāṭar (of Karnāṭaka), Kuṭakar (the Coorg), Ōvar (?) and a meeting with Chañchayan (Sañjaya), the messenger sent by Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar meeting the invader, defeat of the northern kings, Kanaka and Vijaya, and the stone being brought after a dip in the Gaṅgā. Now, the core idea behind the whole episode is the arrival of a 'stone' from the North. The stone was used for making the image of Pattiṉikkaṭavuḷ 'Goddess of Chastity'. This gives clue to the fact that the first ever made image of a deity in stone in Tamil tradition is that of Kaṇṇakī who gets goddess-metamorphosed into Pattiṉikkaṭavuḷ (Kalidos 1993: 68-106), also called Maṅkalamaṭantai 'the Auspicious one', established in a *kōṭṭam* 'temple' (*Chilampu. XXX*, 1. 88). We have noted above the numerous references to artisans from the ṅorth to monuments of architectural value, presented by the northern kings to the Tamils. These may be allegorical references to the incoming stone-made pieces of art from the North. There is a reference to *kuchcharakkuṭikaḷ*[24] in *Maṇimēkalai* (XVIII, 1. 145) which is very important in the context of an idea suggested by Satyanathaier (1988: 154). He is of the opinion that it stands for a rock-cut cave. R. Nàgasamy (1964: 265-68) in a paper on Pāṇḍyan cave temples suggests that the rock-cut cave at Piḷḷaiyārpaṭṭi bears an inscription that could be dated in the 5th century AD. The concerned record has no reference to the foundation of the cave temple but provision for its maintenance which means the origin is earlier than the 5th century AD. This is to point out that long before Mahendravarman I (*c.* 610-30 AD) undertook the excavation at Maṇṭakappaṭṭu, the rock-cut art had set its root in the Tamil country. It is highly possible that in this move the Sātavāhanas acted as intermediaries, spoken in the context of their friendly intercourse with the Chēras as related in the *Chilampu* and the arrival of the stone through them or at their instance. The inference is made possible if we take into account the contribution of Sātavāhanas to rock-cut art in western India, especially around Puṇe (e.g. Bhāje and Kārle), Nāsik and Kānherī. Furthermore, the Guḍimallam Liṅga is also assigned to the same period (*c.* BC to 200 AD).

I want to emphasise the views aired in the foregoing paragraph because most of

the authorities (e.g. Srinivasan 1964: 47), basing on the Maṇṭakappaṭṭu inscription, consider the rock-cut cave on the site as the earliest work in Tamilnadu, assigned to the early 7th century AD. A case against the long-accepted theory was presented by the author recently.[25] An examination of the data, bearing on Sātavāhanas, culled out from the *Chilampu* (XXVI, *Kāḷkōṭkātai)* provides more evidences to confirm our thesis. We do not know how the image of Kaṇṇaki, Pattiṉikkaṭavuḷ or Maṅkalamaṭantai was carved, but it should have been one of the mould of Ardhanārī with a pap on the right side (for a detailed examination, see Kalidos 1993: 68-106). Iḷaṅkō describes in detail the process by which she was installed in a temple which is called Maṅkalamaṭantai-kōṭṭam *(Chilampu*, XXX, I. 88), Pattinikkōṭṭam (*Chilampu* , XXX, 1. 151) and Kuṇavāyir-kōṭṭam, 'temple facing the east?' (Somasundaranar 1977: 201). Iḷaṅkō presents no description of the image, but in a particular context he refers to the Goddess, appearing in front of Cheṅkuṭṭuvaṉ, to confer her blessings. A phantom emerges above the skies, wearing anklets (*chilampu*), bracelet, bangles, ear-studs of diamond, and other golden ornaments, resembling a creeper of lightning (*Chilampu,* XXIX, v. 9). The consecration of the image in a temple, institution of regular *pūjā*-s and appointment of a priestess are all described in which celebration the kings of Coorg (Kuṭakar), Koṅkaṇa (Koṅkar), Mālwā (Maḷuvar) and Kayvāku of the Island (Gajabhāhu of Laṅkā) in addition to the Āryan kings (*Āriyamaṉṉar*) of the North are said to have participated *(Chilampu*, XXX, II. 150-60). This perphas is the earliest *prathiṣṭha* of a *pratimā* (*mūlabera*) that we come across in any Tamil text. The fact that a full-fledged stone image was installed is by all means possible since all in the *Chilampu* could not be brushed aside as apocryphal.

In establishing the idea relating to the pre-Maṇṭakappaṭṭu phase of rock-cut art in Tamilnadu, we may also take into account the Guḍimallam-Liṅga. Its date is a solid point even if it could be assigned to the 2nd century AD. Then, comes the question of authorship. Spoken with reference to the numerous texual authorities, cited in the paper (fn. 14 & 15), it is almost clear that the entire land up to the Tirupati hills was under control of the Tamil kings (see also Sastri 1972 a: 4, Subrahmanian 1980: 38). The inscriptional evidences of the Guḍimallam temple also support its Tamil patronage down to the Chola times (Sarma 1982: 42). The image of the Liṅga itself is in marked contrast with one of the antique type, housed in the Tirumeyyam cave temple.[26] The *gajapṛiṣhṭha-vimāna,* a separate shrine for Ammaṉ (Devī) in *drāviḍa* pattern, shrines for Murukaṉ-Vaḷḷi (the latter a typical Tamil goddess) and Chaṇḍikeśvara (another element typical of Nāyaṉmār tradition) all go in support of the view that the Guḍimallam temple through the ages (for details, see Sarma 1982: 39-64) should have been under the custody of the Tamil rulers, not to speak of its foundation. Had it been in the 2nd century BC, there is no case for Sātavāhana origin in spite of the presence of their pottery (Sarma 1982: 40) since their power at that time was exercised in the upper

Deccan. Even if we come down to 200 AD, the literary data forthcoming from Chaṅkam provide a case for Tamil sovereignty there. We may not be in a position to trace the actual founders and the early patrons, but the fact that Guḍimallam-Liṅga was a work of the Tamils is a case in consideration. I.K. Sarma (1982: 62-63) heads towards such an end, but fails to come out due to some reservations.

So, there is every reason to enhance the view that rock-cut art in Tamilnadu gets back to the days of Guḍimallam. The Pallavas under Mahendravarman and Narasiṁhavarman nurtured it into a sophisticated form. The reference to *kuchcharak-kuṭikai* in the *Maṇimēkalai* and imagery of Pattiṉikkaṭavuḷ as reflected in the *Chilappatikāram* which traces its authority to earlier sources (cf. fn. 22) are further supports to the theory. The mystery centering around the origin of the Piḷḷaiyārpaṭṭi cave temple lends further support to our thesis. In recent times it has been suggested that the bas-relief of Śeṣhaśāyīn[27] which is parallel to the Gupta work at Udayagiri in Madhya Pradesh (Latha 1992) and the Tirupparaṅkuṉram north group of caves (Kalidos 1991 and Rajarajan 1991)[28] are likely to be much earlier when compared with Maṇṭakappaṭṭu. Few of the cave temples in the Pāṇḍya country such as Pirāṉmalai, Tirumalai (Rajarajan 1992: 489-94) and Tiruccentūr (Vaḷḷi-*kukai* `Cave of Valli') are in archaic pattern when compared with the Mahendravarman type and are sure to be earlier in point of time.

The Sātavāhanas who popularised the rock-cut art in western India by making their presence felt at centres like Nāsik, Kārle and Kānherī are likely to have provided the technical know-how in this direction to the Tamil architects. The arrival of stone from the North may be with a view to bring the northern soft varieties (supple basalt or sandstone) since granite was abundantly found locally, the meddling technique of which perhaps required time for the Tamil architects to learn. If by this way few of the Sātavāhana architects had migrated to Guḍimallam, it may explain why their potsherds are present on the site. We need more evidences to establish our hypothesis on a strong footing. But one thing is sure and that is the introduction of rock-cut art in Tamilnadu during the Sātavāhana period. This is allegorically pointed out in the *Chilampu* with reference to the arrival of the stone from the Himālayas at the instance of the Sātavāhanas. Another important point is that Maṇṭakappaṭṭu is not the earliest rock-cut work in Tamilnaḍu. The Guḍimallam-Liṅga, the Tirumeyyam Śeṣhaśāyin and Liṅgodbhavamūrti, and few of the Pāṇḍya cave temples (e.g. Pirāṉmalai and Tiruchchentūr) are likely to be earlier works.

Notes and References

1. This is an antiquated view not held by historians commonly. The epoch of the Sātavāhana rule is now commonly placed about mid-first century BC. *Vide* Shastri 1972 : 103-9; 1987 3-15; 1998 27ff–Ed.

2. It was a wrong notion created by Sir R.G. Bhandarkar. In fact, this expression refers to some of the successors of the Andhra-Sātavāhanas who were their servants (*bhṛityas)*–Ed.
3. Śaṅgam (Skt.), as it is popular with historians (Sastri 1966:115-45, 1972; Basham 1971:464), stands for an Academy of Scholars who were present at Maturai, its base, for propagation of the Tamil idioms in art and letters. Maturai in Chaṅkam literature is called Kūṭal (=śaṅgam) and Nāṉmāṭakkūṭal 'Confluence of the towered-gateways four' (Kalidos 1991: 264). Śaṅgam in Tamil is transliterated into Chaṅkam according to the *Tamil Lexicon* method which we follow in the present paper.
4. *The Holy Bible* (King James version, the Gideons, 1980 ed.), First (or commonly called Third) Book of the Kings, ch. 10, v. 22 (p. 402). The original runs as follows: ''For the king (Solomon) has at sea a navy of Hiran: once in three years came the navy of Thar'shish, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks''. Queen She'ba is said to have visited Solomon (ch.10, vv.2, 10) and presented him with camel-load of ''spices'', ''very much gold'' and ''precious stones'', supposedly from the East, especially Kerala (Chēranāḍu) and Tamiḻakam.
5. *Kavāṭa* also means 'gate'. Kapāṭapuram is supposed to be famous for its gateways which perhaps lead to the prefix, *nāṉmāṭm* in Kūṭal, in nostalgic memory of the once famous metropolis.
6. The word *ārya* originally had only a cultural import and the race connotation was given to it by Europeans in modern times. Likewise, Draviḍa was a purely geographical term.–Ed.
7. *Vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri 1996 : 337-38.
8. This is an antiquated view and now the inscription is placed by scholars generally in 1st century BC-AD.—Ed.
9. Many of the authors of the so-called Chaṅkam works (as listed by Subrahmanian 1980: 22) are Jains. Examples are Iḷaṅkō, author of the *Chilappatikāram* (*Chilpampu*), Māṅkuṭimarutaṉār of *Maturakkāñchī*, and most authors of the Eighteen Minor works (e.g. *Nālaṭiyār* and *Paḻamoḻi*), mostly didactic works in Buddhist-Jain model (Aiyar 1969: 63-66).
10. These include *Tolkāppiyam, Pattuppāṭṭu* `*Ten Idylls', Eṭṭuttokai* 'Eight Anthologies', *Chilappatikāram, Maṇimēkalai and Patiṇeṇkīḻkkaṇakku. The 'Ten' are Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai, Poruṇarāṟṟuppaṭai, Chirupāṇāṟṟuppaṭai, Perumpāṇṟṟuppaṭai, Mullaippāṭṭu, Maturaikkāñchi, Neṭunalvāṭai, Kuṟiñchippāṭṭu, Paṭṭiṉappālai and Malaipaṭukaṭām. The `Eight' are Naṟṟiṇai, Kuṟuntokai, Aiṅkuṟuṉūṟu, Patiṟṟuppattu, Paripāṭal, Kalittokai, Akanāṉūṟu* and *Puṟanāṉūṟu. The `Eighteen'' are Tirukkuṟaḷ, Nālaṭiyār, Nāṉmaṇikkaṭikai, Iṉṉānāṟpatu, Iṉiyavaiṉāṟpatu, Kaḷavaḻinārpatu, Kārnāṟpatu, Aintiṇaiaimpatu, Aintinaieḻupatu, Tiṇaimālainūṟṟaimpatu, Tiṇaimoḻiaimpatu, Tirikaṭukam, Achārakkōvai, Paḻamoḻi, Chiṟupañchamūlam, Iṇṇilai, Muṟumoḻikkāñchī and Ēlāti* (Sundaranar 1965). Totally 2,381 poems (33,000 lines) by 473 poets are listed (Kalidos 1976: 67). For a brief account, see Basham (1971: 464-78).
11. Later sources provide evidence of such a literary association. The Larger Chinnamanur Plates of Rājasiṁha Pāṇḍya (*c.* 900-920 AD) talk of a translation of the *Mahābhārata* by

the Chaṅkam at Maturai. To quote: *Māpātant Tamilppaṭuttum Maturāpuri chaṅkam vaittum* (*SII*, III, 4). Āṇṭāḷ, one among the Vaiṣhṇava (she)mystics (Āḻvār), refers to *Chaṅkat-tamil-mālai* `garland of the Tamil Academy' with reference to her own masterpiece, the *Tiruppāvai* (Kalidos 1993a).

12. The Pāṇḍya, Chēra, Chōḻa, Veḷirs and minor kings used to form leagues at times of war among themselves. A good case is recorded in *Puṟanāṉūṟu* (No. 110) in which the triple-kings are said to have marched against the ruler of Paṟampu, Pāri, who refused to give his daughter in marriage to any of them. The *Chilampu* (XXIX, v.25) has a subtle hint at this united front of the Tamils. Cheṅkuṭṭuvaṉ, who triumphed over kings of the North, is called Lord of the country from the north-stone to south-Kumārī (*vaṉperunīkal teṉkumari yāṇṭa*) who bears the totemic emblems of Chēra (*vil* `bow'), Pāṇḍya (*kayal* `fish') and Chōḻa (*puḷi* `tiger'). To quote: *cheruviṟ kayaṟpuliyāṉ*. Only in case of the united front such a combination of emblems, characteristic of the three states, would have been possible.

13. The *Akaṉāṇūṟu* (No. 251) notes the neo-Maurya (*pakaittalai vanta vampaMōriyar*) marching against the Tamil country. Other works like the *Paṭṭiṉappālai* and *Patiṟṟuppattu* (also the *Chilappatikāram*) eulogise Karikāla-chōḻa and Cheṅkuṭṭuvaṉ-chera (*infra*) and credit them with conquest of the Himālayas.

14. To quote the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* (No. 17): *Teṉkumārī vaṭaperuṅkal/Kuṇakuṭa kaṭalāvellai* 'the bounds (of the Tamil country) are Kumārī in the south, the huge rock (i.e. Tirupati hills; cf. *Tolkāppiyam, Chiṟappuppāyiram* 11.1-3: *vaṭaveṅkaṭam teṉkumāri/āyiṭait/*Tamiḻ *kūṟum nallulakam* 'the land where good Tamil is spoken extends from Vēṅkaṭam in the north to Cape Comorin in the south') and the oceans to the east and west.

15. The *Chilappatikāram* (XVIII, 11. 1-2) records the same tradition as found in the previous note. To quote: *Neṭyoṉ kuṉramum toṭiyoḷ pauvamum/ Tamiḻvaram paṟutta taṇpuṉal naṉṉāṭu* 'The best of countries where Tamil (sovereignty) reigns supreme is from the hill of Neṭiyon ('the tall one', i.e. Vishṇu-(Trivikrama) of Tirupati) to the ocean of the girl (i.e. Kaṉyā-kumārī)'. The country is called Tamilakam in Champuttīvu (Jambudvīpa) (*Maṇimēkalai* XVII, 1. 62).

16. See the reference to *vampaMoriyar* in *Akananuru* (No. 251) (Ramachandran 1974: 13) meaning new-Mauryas (Sathyanathaier 1988: 154) in a vein that the nava-Nandas are supposed to refer to the neo(or nine)-Nandas (Sastri, ed. 1967: 20). The Nandas as rulers of Pāṭaliputra are noted in a poem (*Akañaṉūṟu* No. 265 : *palpukaḻ niṟainta velpōr Nantar/chīrmiku Pāṭalik kuḻī ik Kaṅkai/nīrmutar karanta nitiyam kollō*).

17. The gem workers of Magadha, the goldsmiths of Marāṭhā (cf. Gopalachari 1976: 10; the Sātavāhanas were Mahāraṭhi-s), the blacksmiths of Avanti and the Yavana sculptors collaborated with the Tamils in the making of artistic pieces. To quote: *Makata viṉaiṅarum marāṭṭak kammarum/Avantik kollarum Yavanat tachcharum/Taṉ-Tamiḻ viṉaiñarum tammōṭu kūṭi (kūṭi* 'collaborate'). The *Chilampu* (XXVIII, 11.86-87) refers to a painted pavilion (*chitramaṇḍapa*) and a sitting of the Choḷa king in the company of the kings of Vajra, Avanti and Magadha. To quote: *Vachchira Mavanti Makatamōṭukuḻiiya/chittiramaṇṭapat tirukka ventaṉ*.

18. The temples listed are *amararta*rukkōṭṭam (for the *Kalpakavṛiksha*), *veḷyāṉaikkōṭṭam* (for the white elephant, i.e. the Airāvata, Indra's mount), *pukarveḷḷai nākartaṅ kōṭṭam* (for Baladeva), *pakalvāyil uchchikkiḻāṉ kōṭṭam* (for Sūrya), *ūrkkoṭṭam* (of the *nagara-devatā*, called Chamāpati), *velkkōṭṭam* (for the lance of Murukan), *vachchirakkoṭṭam* (for the personified *Vajra* 'thunderbolt'), *puṟampaṉaiyānvāḻ koṭṭam* (for the God who recides in outskirts of cities, i.e. Chāttaṉ, or Māchāttaṉ; Skt. Śāstā or Mahāśāstā), *nikkantakkoṭṭam* (for the Jina), *nilākkoṭṭam* (for Chandra, Moon God), Pāchaṇṭachchāttaṉ, *Chuṭukāṭṭukkoṭṭam* (temple of the graveyard, meant for Iṭākiṉippey, the ghoul called Ḍākinī) and *Kāmaveḷ-koṭṭam* (for Kāma, God of Love). Pāchaṇṭachchāttan figures prominently in another context also in the *Chilampu* (XX, 11. 69, 87). At the time of the consecration of the image of Pattiṉikkaṭavūḷ, it is he who through an oracle helps trace the history of the Goddess. (*infra*, fn. 22).

19. There is no logic behind such an arguement because of the several temples and their presiding deities. Two different *koṭṭam-s* for the same God within a particular context are not possible.

20. Basing on the authority of the commentator, Aṭiyārkkunallār (14th century AD) *vide* Somasundaranar 1977: 332. He is identified with Māchāttāṉ (Skt. Mahāśāstā).

21. Citing the Girnār, Tālaguṇḍa and Kānherī inscriptions, Gopalachari (1976: 39) derives the name Sātakarṇi (not Śatakarṇi), meaning one with 'a sharp ear'.

22. Book III (*Vañchikkāṇṭam*) of the *Chilampu* supplies plenty of evidences to support the notion. The following personages help to trace the story: (1) the hunters (*chirukuṭiyōr*) who informs Cheṅkuṭṭuvaṉ of the one-breasted Goddess ascending the heavens above, (2) Chittalai Chāttaṉār who elaborates upon the clues supplied by the hunters, (3) a *brāhmaṇa* by name, Māṭalamaṟaiyoṉ, who narrates the events in detail to Cheṇkuṭṭuvaṉ, (4) the girl, Tēvantī, who attended on Kaṇṇaki, adds to Māṭalaṉ's version (she is later appointed the priestess of Kaṇṇaki temple), and (5) the oracle (of Pāchaṇṭachchattaṉ) through Tēvantī gives more details which are interpreted by Māṭalaṉ. Tevantī is said to be a *brāhmaṇa* woman.

23. Several interpretations are given in explanation of the term: (1) According to Jinaprabhasūri (14th century AD) it means a giver (*sanoti*) of vehicles (*vāhanāni*). (2) According to *Kathāsaritsāgara* 'he who rode a *yaksha*, called Sāta (in the form of an elephant) is Sātavāhana.' (3) It is supposed to mean 'son of horse', born through *aśvamedha* sacrifice, according to M. Przyluski who traces the word to Muṇḍā language sources (*sādaṁ, sadāṁ* and *sādāṁ* 'horse' and *han* or *hapan* [*vāhana*] 'son'). According to Shastri (1997), it means a 'horse man' (sāda-sāta)-'horse'; vāhana-rider.

24. *Kuchchara* is equated with Gūrjara (of Mālwā) and *kuṭikai* 'hut', may again point out the import of rock-cut idea from Mālwā, the region where it acquired a classical format after the initial steps taken by Aśokan architects in Bārābār.

25. Raju Kalidos, ''Origin of Cave Temples in Tamilnadu: Some Logical Arguments'', Paper presented in the Indian Art History Congress, Dharwad, 1993. See also Rajarajan (1992: 494).

26. Images of Liṅgodbhavamūrti at the mature stage of development are found in the Kailāsanātha temple at Kāñchī and Ellorā caves (Nos. XV & XVI); the core *Sthāṇu*, fitted with Chandraśekhara with in its viscera, Brahmā and Vishṇu to the right and left of the shaft. The rudiments are to be found in Tirumeyyam which is stage 1 of the process. Others on the way are the images found in Piḷḷaiyārpaṭṭi and Kunnakkuṭi cave temples. Of all the types, Tirumeyyam is archaic in form and represents a development over the Guḍimallam image which is likely to have provided the model (Kalidos 1988: ch. III).

27. Three subsequent stages of development in respect of the Tirumeyyam cave are noticeable: (1) The original *bas-relief* of Śeshaśāyin, (2) Addition of a *maṇḍapa* (cf. Govardhanadhārin panel in Māmallapuram), and (3) Donations to the temple, inscribed at about the end of the 7th or early 8th century AD.

28. Several stages are traceable in the Tirupparaṅkunram north group also. They are (1) The twin cellae for Liṅga-Somāskanda and Vishṇu-Vaikuṇṭhamūrti, (2) The cellae for Durgādevī, Jyeshṭhādevī and water reservoir, noted in the inscription (*IA*, II:67), and (3) the cellae for Gajalakshmī and Bhuvaneśvarī. For a detailed examination, see Rajarajan (1991: 394-408).

Bibliography

A.V. Subramania, Aiyar (1969), *Tamil Studies*, Tirunelveli.

Arthaśāstra, ed. & tr. R.P. Kangle, Bombay, 1960-63, 3 vols.

Akanānūru, Kalaham, ed., Madras, 1970.

A.L. Basham, *The Wonder That was India*, Calcutta, 1971.

The Holy Bible, the Gideons, 1980 (USA).

R. Caldwell (1956 ed.), *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, Madras.

Chilappatikāram, ed. P.V. Somasundaranar, Madras, 1977.

S.K. Chatterji (1965), *Dravidian*, Annamalainagar.

EI Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XX.

K. Gopalachari (1976), *Early History of the Andhra Country*, Madras; *IA* Vol. II.

Raju Kalidos (1976) *History and Culture of the Tamils*, Dindigul.

——— (1988) Iconography of Early Medieval South India, Vol. II, Śaiva (UGC Major Project Report). Thanjavur.

——— (1991) "Structure and Organisation of the Tirupparaṅkuṇṛam Caves", *Annali AION*, Naples, Vol. 51:3.

——— (1992) Iconography of Early Medieval South India, Vol. IV Gaṇapati and Skanda (UGC Major Project Report). Thanjavur.

——— (1992a) "Origin of Cave Temples in Tamilnadu: Some Logical Arguments", Seminar Paper, Dharwad.

——— (1993) ''The twain-face of Ardhanārī'', *Acta Orientalia,* Copenhagen, Vol. 54.

——— (1993a) ''The Tamil Concept of Bhakti: A Case Study of Tiruppāvai'', in *Cave Temples of South India...*, Naples (forthcoming).

V. Kanakasabhai (1966 ed.), *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred years Ago,* Madras.

V. Latha, (1992) Art of Tirumeyyam. M. Phil thesis, Tamil University, Thanjavur.

Maṇimēkalai, ed. P.V. Somasundaranar, Madras, 1975.

R. Nagasamy (1964), ''Some Contributions of the Pāṇḍyas to South Indian Art'', *Artibus Asiae,* Vol. XXVII.

Puṛanāṇūru, Kalaham ed., Madras, 1973.

C.E. Ramachandran (1974), *Ahanāṇūru in its Historical Setting,* Madras.

K.V. Raman (1977), *Pāṇṭiyot Varalāru* in Tamil, Madras.

R.K.K. Rajarajan (1991), ''Further Light in Tirupparankuṇṛam Caves'', *Annali AION,* Naples, Vol. 51:4.

——— (1992) ''The Cave Temple at Tirumalai: Its Icongraphical Significance'', *East and West,* Rome, Vol. 42:2-4.

K.A. Nilakanta Sastri (1966), *A History of South India,* Bombay.

——— (1972) *The Pandyan Kingdom,* Madras.

——— (1972a) *The Śaṅgam Age: Its Cults and Cultures,* Madras.

——— ed. (1967), *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas,* Delhi.

R. Sathyanathaier (1988 ed.), *A Political and Cultural History of India,* Madras, Vol. I.

I.K. Sarma (1982), *The Development of Early Śaiva Art and Architecture,* Delhi.

Ajay Mitra Shastri (1972 ed.), *Coinage of the Sātavāhanas and Coins from Excavations,* Nagpur.

——— (1987), *Early History of the Deccan: Problems and Perspectives,* Delhi.

——— (1996), *Varāhamihira's India,* New Delhi.

——— (1998), *The Sātavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas: A Historical Framework,* Nagpur.

SII (South Indian Inscriptions), Vol. III.

V.A. Smith (1962), *The Early History of India,* Oxford.

P.V. Somasundaranar (1977), see *Chilappatikāram.*

K.R. Srinivasan (1964), *Cave Temples of the Pallavas,* New Delhi.

N. Subrahmanian (1980), *Śaṅgam Polity,* Madurai.

P. Meenakshi Sundaranar (1965), *History of Tamil Literature,* Hyderabad.

Tolkappiyam, ed. M. Arunachalam Pillai, Madurai, 1976.

S. Vaiyapuri Pillai (1956), *History of Tamil Language and Literature,* Madras.

Kamil V. Zvelebil, (1981), *Tiru Murugan,* Madras.

CULTURAL STUDIES

CULTURAL STUDIES

10

Urban Settlements in the Deccan and Sātavāhana History

ALOKA PARASHAR-SEN

Innumerable *coins* of the Sātavāhana kings, the flourishing state of *Buddhism* under the rule of the Sātavāhanas and the great proliferation of archaeological sites associated with the *material culture* of the Sātavāhana levels of habitation, are among the several features about the history of the Sātavāhanas in the Deccan that cannot be sidelined for any study of this period. Indeed, these *three elements* are crucial for our study of the urban settlements in early historic Deccan as well. Further, for the first *state formation* in South India, Deccan interestingly emerges as the nuclei and, from our point of view, this cannot be detached from an integrated study of the economic, social and cultural *variations* of the various sub-regions of the Deccan.

In other words, we would like to argue that the nature and growth of urban settlements in the Deccan during the early historical period was embedded in : (*a*) the particular *ecological* sub-region of the Deccan where they were located, (*b*) consequently, the particular sub-regional variation of the proto-historic diversity which was essentially related to the *agrarian* development in the respective sub-regions, (*c*) the rise, and then spread of *political power* in the different sub-regions and its nature, and finally, (*d*) the impact of *Buddhism* as the ideological influence on the particular form an urban centre took and its definition.

It has been noticed by us that whenever the study of early historic urbanization in India has been discussed, great pains have been taken to emphasize on how urbanization around the third millennium BC of the Bronze Age in the Indus valley was ecologically[1] *different* from that of the Ganges valley around the sixth century BC during the Iron Age.[2] This, it is rightly considered, was essential to highlight the

techno-economic variations and the extent to which this can explain the causes for the rise of the cities in these two fertile river valleys of the subcontinent. However, in reflecting on the rise of urbanization in regions like the Deccan, no similar attempt is made by scholars though a considerable stress is laid on the late start of the urbanization process in these parts. In other words, a chronologically late development is often looked at in terms of an overemphasis on diffusion of socio-economic contacts with regions that were already developed, and thus, *the ecological variations that are equally necessary to explain the particular form urban settlements take, are relegated to the background.* In this paper we intend to dwell on the varying nature of urban settlements in the various sub-regions of the Deccan and view these variations in terms of their locations in essentially different ecological zones. This may also suggest that giving uniform universalistic definitions to an urban centre is a problematic exercise and, therefore, the nature and processes of urbanization need to be emphasized on a different plane.[3]

Historical perspectives available on the early history of the Deccan give undue emphasis to describing its political features[4] and by the very nature these books dwell on giving details of dynastic importance and the political events of the period without any relevant discussion on the social base that made the Sātavāhana state possible. In fact, at a broader level, this is essential because rise of state is concomitant with the rise of civilization and urbanization in recent anthropological and archaeological writings.[5]

The rise of the Sātavāhana power in the Deccan is generally put against the chronological background of the views of scholars which fall into two broad categories.[6] The more acceptable is one that advocates the shorter chronology, which in the view of Ajay Mitra Shastri is clearly evident in the light of the available material information. He thus concludes, in support of the shorter chronology, that the Sātavāhanas had risen in the middle or latter half of the first century BC.[7] Dynamic economic and social changes have hitherto been always understood in terms of the influence of the Mauryan rule. This can be dated, on the basis of the evidence of the Mauryan inscriptions, belonging to the third century BC.[8] However, for the analysis of the processes of pre-urban situation and of the agrarian situation in the Deccan, we have to turn to the megalithic cultures and their relation to the antecedent neolithic and chalcolithic cultures of South India as a whole.[9]

The Deccan has been understood by us as a heterogeneous entity, given the physiographic and ecological peculiarities of its four distinct entities. They are divided thus on the basis of their particular physiographic characteristics and termed as the Western Deccan *(Sub-region A)* with its high altitude Ghāṭs and strategic passes, the Central Deccan *(Sub-region B)* with its upland plateau, the Eastern Deccan *(Sub-region C)* with its fertile plains, and the Southern Deccan *(Sub-region D)* with the upper

reaches of the Kṛishṇā Tungabhardā plains and the Mysore plateau. These sub-regions of the Deccan were the specific locale for the origin, growth and then expansion of the Sātavāhana power but at *chronologically varied times* and in this sense, some of the sub-regions like the Western and the Eastern Deccan have been the most discussed sub-regions not only in terms of the political history of the region, but also in terms of understanding the early history of Buddhism and the growth of early historic trade and urban centres.[10] Both are rich in inscriptional and numismatic material which is available for the study of early historic society in these two sub-regions. In recent decades, new numismatic and archaeological data help us to stress on regional variation, ecological differences and their subsequent influence on the material and cultural setting of ancient Deccan. Elsewhere, we have taken up a micro-level analysis of the Central and Southern Deccan, and in our view, the former saw the genesis for the rise of early State in the Deccan.[11] This study has enabled us to suggest significant historical trends that emphasize on a study of the internal dynamics of change in the early historic society of the Deccan rather than look at change in these parts only in terms of influences from outside.[12]

It has been pointed out that iron was more profusely used in the Deccan than in the North[13] though its technological variations reveal a lack of prosperity.[14] The diffusion of this technology was associated with the distinctive Black and Red Ware pottery and Megaliths almost uniformly all over South India.[15] The development of a more complex social and economic pattern of existence was thus set and there emerged a way of life that was different from the earlier agricultural life based on dry farming.[16] However, we know far greater details about the burials than about the habitation area of the people associated with the Megalithic culture and generally, the former was situated away from the latter or, any area of tilled land.[17] Dilip K. Chakravarti in his writing about 'Issues of the Indian Iron Age' points out that in the context of the Iron Age in southern Deccan in particular and the South Indian peninsula as a whole in general, ''the early historic period... did not begin till the third century BC. The period between c. 1,100 – 1,200 BC and c. 3rd century BC is a long one and suggests a substantial Iron Age occupation of the region'', and further questions, ''but have we really got beyond the enumeration of megalithic burial types and related assemblages?''[18] Indeed, the Iron Age base of its early historic period has been only partially and imperfectly understood.

Hitherto, an overemphasis on the diffusionist theory had left little room for understanding indigenous development of cultural processes. Today, even in writings on the north Indian Ganges valley early historic urbanization there has developed a critical view of the apparently 'revolutionary' role that iron may have played in the formation of urban centres.[19] In this context an alternative is found in the work of Erdosy for the

Ganges valley, who would like to see the crucial indicator for the rise of urban centres "in the development of a hierarchy of settlement types on a regional scale" and therefore, regard the "sociocultural transformations accompanying the rise of cities as the central issue".[20] Thus, rather than bemoaning the lack of the role iron played in the transformation of the Deccan society into a fully urban one during the centuries BC, we need to, first and foremost, identify the gradual aggregation of social groups in different settlements and place them in an essential continuum leading towards civilization. In this transition the Deccan reflects a heterogeneous picture and we, therefore, need to emphasize upon the importance of the existence, or co-existence, of particular sub-regions as independent or semi-independent entities contributing to the whole region's historical development. We cannot also suggest a unilinear stage of development from pastoralism to agriculture wherein one mode of production gives way to another. Thus, the details of not only the economic structures but also of the political and social systems that controlled and manoeuvred these diverged conspicuously in each of the sub-regions.

The characteristics of each sub-region for understanding the spread of the pre-urban antecedent cultures and their relationship and in some cases, transformation to the early historic urban society, is the next focus of attention wherein we summarize the results of our research which have been detailed in the charts appended to this paper.

The first settled village communities, with some form of an organized, but nascent, political authority in the sub-regions of the Deccan can be traced to the Chalcolithic cultures which have been dated around 2000-1000 BC. These cultures are clearly identifiable, and substantially found in the Western Deccan at sites like Bahal, Daimābād, Ināmgāon, Nāsik, Nāvadāṭoli, Nevāsā, Jorwe, Chāṇḍolī and Prakāsh (Chart I). On the other hand, sites like Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and Kesarapallī in the Eastern Deccan suggest a Chalcolithic intrusive phase on an already existing Neolithic culture which has been dated to around 1500 BC.[21] There are few well-documented Chalcolithic sites in this sub-region (Chart II). A Chalcolithic intrusion and overlap with Neolithic settlements is much more clearly documented in the Southern Deccan, and many sites here like Brahmagiri, Hallūr, Maskī, Piklihāl, Saṅgankallu, Ṭekkalakoṭa and Veerāpuram indicate well-defined Chalcolithic settlements (Chart IV). This is in clear contrast to the near total absence of Chalcolithic settlements in the Central Deccan with the rare exception of the recently excavated sites of Aḍam and Chagtur. Instead, the Neolithic settlements in this sub-region are immediately followed by the Megalithic iron-using cultures at most of the sites (Chart III).

For these early agricultural settlements, in the Western Deccan in particular, it has been suggested that they flourished on black cotton soil and this ecological feature

seems to have considerably influenced the nature of the early village-based cultures.[22] Interestingly, after the decline of the Chalcolithic cultures, the Western Deccan witnesses the apparent sudden emergence of the early historic cultures with a total absence of the proto-historic archaeological cultures based on iron technology known throughout the Deccan with megalith characteristics (Chart I). Though in the context of the Western Deccan there has been some evidence of the disapearance of the Chalcolithic cultures,[23] the same cannot be said for the other sub-regions of the Deccan. In contrast to this in the Eastern Deccan, the other major region like the Western Deccan, where urban centres are said to flourish in the early historical period, Iron Age emerges either, in an overlap situation with the Chalcolithic or, immediately succeeding it. Thus, a glance at the pre-third century BC period (Charts I-III) for the Western and Eastern Deccan reveals that for the former, except for Kauṇḍinyapura where there is some evidence of megalithic burials and Bahal and Prakāsh where there is substantial evidence of the use of iron, most of the other settlements do not indicate the presence of a significant cultural phase that can be called an Iron Age. The Eastern Deccan (Chart III) does reveal greater evidence of iron, often associated with megalithic burial or habitation areas. This is not only at major settlements like Amarāvatī, Dharaṇikoṭa, Jaggayyāpeṭa, Kesarapallī, Nāgārjuna-koṇḍa and Yelleśwaram but also at lesser known sites such as Agiripallī, Guḍimellanka, Kanukollu, Peddamarrūr and so on (Chart III). The cultures with megalithic characteristics are, however, found more prolifically in the other two sub-regions of the Southern Deccan and the Central Deccan which have been generally dated to between 1100 BC – 100 AD. They are prominently identifiable in the Southern Deccan at major sites like Brahmagiri, Chinnamarrūr, and Hallūr and smaller ones like Hulikallu, Kalyāṇdurg and Kambaduru whereas Chandravallī, Maskī, Piklihāl and many others show evidence of the Iron Age in these parts. Bhāgī Maharī, Budigapally, Chagtūr, Kadambapur, Khāpā, Kolakoṇḍa, Naikuṇḍ, Paunār, Paunī, Polakoṇḍa, Peddabankūr, Pochampāḍu, and Ṭākalghāṭ are some of the significant megalithic sites in the Central Deccan though the entire Vidarbha and Karīmnagar regions are strewn with evidence of Megalith burials.[24] In the Southern, and to a lesser extent, the Eastern Deccan settlements seem to have emerged out of their antecedent Neolithic and Chalcolithic cultures whereas in the Central Deccan including the Vidarbha region, their emergence is apparently sudden and clearly independent of earlier cultures, though occasionally, in the context of an earlier Neolithic culture (Chart II).

Though the megalithic cultures are generally accepted to have some common features, their heterogeneity must be appreciated as well. In all the sub-regions of the Deccan they are not represented in an identical manner. In the Eastern Deccan the megalithic cultures form the essential agrarian background to the early historic phase in the fertile belts of the Kṛishṇā-Godāvarī basin. The sites charted out for the Eastern

and Southern Deccan show that the megalithic people had mostly chosen to settle on fertile reverine beds.[25] It is important to note that in the Eastern Deccan the megalithic cultures have largely been evidenced by the occurrence of ceramic traits like Black and Red ware, Red and Black ware, Black ware, with occasional occurrence of iron objects. Thus the role played by iron in the transformation of the pre-urban society here seems to have been minimal.[26] In fact, like the Western Deccan, here, too, the strategic location of the sites and their easy access with other parts of India played a much more significant role in the subsequent flowering of the urban environment.

When we take a close look at the Iron Age settlements in the Southern Deccan, we recognize that at some sites, they are superimposed on different levels of development of the preceding phase of the Neolithic-Chalcolithic settlements and, therefore, the continuous settlement of these sites marks an important factor in the urbanization of some of them like Brahmagiri. The case of Hallūr is significant in that besides the fact that there is a Chalcolithic-Megalithic overlap, to-date it presents the earliest C^{14} dates for the use of iron in the Deccan, c. 1000 BC,[27] but there is no development of this site as an urban one during the early historical period. The same is not true of the sites in the Karīmnagar and Vidarbha regions of the Central Deccan. Only at Peddabaṅkūr and Polakoṇḍa are the antecedent cultures to the Megalithic phase overlapped with a substantial Neolithic occupation indicated by the scores of ground stone tools found here.[28] In comparing the Southern and Central Deccan, which are both rich in Megalithic sites, it has to nonetheless be pointed out that Megalith-related artifacts like horse remains, and particularly, iron tools and implements are found more prolifically in the Central Deccan.[29] Indeed, by far the most striking aspect of the megalithic economy in this sub-region was its ability to generate iron objects on a large scale. This is undoubtedly related to the availability of iron in this region.[30] It has been pointed out that a ''number of ancient iron working spots were located in Karīmnagar region at Regoṇḍa, Tellakuṇṭa, etc.'' At the latter site enormous deposits of iron slags and nodules of calcium carbonate indicate this. Indeed here, ''the entire hill range is scattered with iron ore''.[31] The same is true of the Vidarbha region and here, too, a large amount of iron slag indicates that the level of technology was not very high but that iron was locally and easily available cannot be doubted.[32] Both these localities of the Central Deccan can be contrasted with the Southern Deccan where, for instance, at Piklihāl (Chart IV) there is clear evidence that there was an intrusion of people bringing with them iron technology. In all probability the people of the Eastern and Southern Deccan were in contact with the Central Deccan for their supply of iron artifacts.

At a general level, therefore, the economic activities of the megalithic people can be said to be based on either agriculture or pastoral activities with craft specialization depending on the local, regional situations.[33] For instance, at Pochampāḍu and Peddabaṅkūr,

apart from agricultural implements such as flat axes, sickles, spades, hoe-blades and knives, we also find the bone remains of such domesticated animals as cattle, sheep, goat and swine which probably indicate that these formed part of their diet.[34] Against the background of the Vidarbha sites, Deo has vehemently argued to understanding the economy of these settlements as being chiefly based on pastoralism with the community practising only small scale agriculture.[35] On the other hand, for the Southern Deccan most scholars suggest that the megalithic phase represented an agrarian economy with the production of such crops as ragi, rice, sugar cane etc.[36] Apart from burials, the occurrence of megalithic constructions like brick structures, and habitational sites are not as abundant in Southern and Eastern Deccan as in Central Deccan.[37] However, it has been argued by scholars that the nature of the burial equipment in the megalithic cultures clearly indicates the stratification in megalithic society wherein some groups enjoyed ritual-ideological sanctions and consequently power, though this was at this stage still kin-based.[38] The impact of iron technology in the Central Deccan was related to an increased craft production whereas in the Eastern and Southern Deccan, its use can perhaps be suggested for agricultural expansion but it was still not as revolutionary as has been envisioned in all the sub-regions of the Deccan and, therefore, to talk of a clear-cut economically stratified society based on class division is difficult to suggest in this phase of cultural evolution in early Deccan.[39]

The situation in the Western Deccan was significantly different as the megalithic phase here, with a concomitant use of iron on a large scale, is near totally absent. This, together with the inhospitable terrain of the Western Ghāṭs, cut through occasionally by the river courses, was not conducive for large-scale agrarian expansion. However, as mentioned above, its strategic location connecting the ports of the west coast with the North Indian plains on the one hand, and the Southern Peninsular on the other, afforded it a unique environment for the development of nodal points of exchange, and then trade, that finally supported the growth of some of the most important non-religious urban centres in the Deccan as a whole during the early historic period. On the basis of the North Indian perceptions found in literary sources, scholars like Bhandarkar had argued that the civilization in the context of the Deccan, with a focus on Mahārāshtra, only emerged as a result of Aryanisation.[40] Some of the archaeological and numiśmatic sources charted out have, however, helped in changing this picture. Though contacts with the North during the pre-urban phase cannot be totally ruled out, this need not be understood in the form of only Brāhmaṇical influence or Aryanization, but rather contacts through Buddhism and the Mauryas as evident in the archaeological record including finds of Northern Black Polished Ware, punch-marked coins and inscriptions.

Thus, when compared with all the other sub-regions, the Western Deccan sites like

Bahal, Bharuch, Bhokardan, Kauṇḍinyapura, Nāsik, Nevāsā, Paiṭhan and Prakāsh (Chart I) display the maximum occurrence of Northern Black Polished Ware sherds which, at Nāsik at least, have been dated to as early as 500 BC. At some of these sites like Bhokardan, Kauṇḍinyapura, Nāsik, and Nevāsā (Chart I) early punch-marked coins have also been found whereas coins of the pre-Sātavāhana ruling groups have only been found at Brahmapurī in this sub-region. Notable Mauryan presence here is documented at Sopārā and Kaunḍinyapura (Chart I). In the Eastern Deccan interesting evidence of Northern Black Polished Ware has been found at sites like Amarāvatī, Dharaṇikoṭa, Kesarapallī and Vaḍḍmānu. Further, the spread of Buddhism and trade activities here, with the help of the evidence from Amarāvatī, has been dated back to the pre-Aśokan period[41] by I.K. Sarma who also points to the existence of pre-Mauryan punch-marked coins found in coastal Andhra.[42] Both the Eastern and Western Deccan thus show a clear contact with North India in both economic and political terms. It is significant that in archaeological terms, the Mauryan phase here is evident in the megalithic context.[43] This has been substantiated by the megalithic phase being found just below the Stūpa complex at Amarāvatī.[44] At Brahmagiri in the Southern Deccan, too, the material remains of the Iron Age have been used to measure the relationship of the megalithic phase with the Mauryan contact here.[45]

The Mauryan intrusion into the Deccan during the third century BC is well documented, giving a spatial dimension to the extent of Mauryan influence.[46] According to I.K. Sarma, there are several pointers showing a marked Mauryan contact in the Eastern Deccan. Among these are the small Brāhmī inscriptions found at Malakoṇḍa in Prakāśam district,[47] the Black and Red ware found at Amarāvatī which is said to have graffiti marks in Aśoka Brāhmī,[48] and Mauryan punch-marked coins which have been found in Amarāvatī and Dharaṇikoṭa.[49] Mauryan inscriptional and other evidence is amply found in all the sub-regions (Charts I, III, and IV) except for the Central Deccan; the site of Ārṇī and the recently excavated site of Aḍam being exceptions (Chart II). It has been suggested that the conspicuous concentration of the Aśokan edicts in mineral rich areas of the Southern Deccan and important port towns in the Western and Eastern Deccan is indicative of the fact that the interests of the Mauryan State were of an economic nature, namely, in the exploitation of the local resources, and not in territorial annexation and control.[50] Thapar further points to this interest being legitimized by the ideological instrument of the spread of Aśoka's policy of Dharma.[51] Seneviratne[52] suggests that the Mauryan State provided the functional apparatus and an external stimulus to the already existing megalithic societies.[53] Vivmala Begley points to the important economic dent that the Mauryas made in the Eastern Deccan which formed an essential background to the Indo-Roman trade.[54] The Mauryan penetration into certain sub-regions of the Deccan was thus based on its interaction with the already existing kin-based organizations through its links with the political

power of the indigenous chiefs. What is significant to point out in this context is that the evidence of Mauryan contact in all the sub-regions was not uniform and only small localities which had the economic potential of being used were affected. However, the lack of a significant Mauryan presence as in the case of the Central Deccan did not result in this sub-region lagging behind in the development of urban centres during the early historical period though both the nature of their economic growth and institutional support they got was different.

Two aspects of the pre-Sātavāhana situation need to be emphasized in the development of the early historical sites in the Central Deccan. Both these are related to the dynamics of internal changes and transformations in the pre-Sātavāhana society. One was the particular nature of the economy which rested on the small-scale production of iron-related artifacts and the other, on the substantial existence of pre-Sātavāhana levels of habitation, not necessarily related with the Megalithic material remains. We suggest this primarily on the basis of archaeological and numismatic data found at Koṭaliṅgāla. Indeed, the stratigraphy of the excavation independently suggests a clear pre-Sātavāhana level.[55] At Peddabaṅkūr, Dhulikaṭṭa and Koṇḍāpuṛ considerable amount of iron objects was present and at the first two sites Megaliths and All Black Ware pottery were also found. [56] Whereas the availability of iron objects is equally prolific in the Vidarbha sites, what adds a significant dimension to defining this phase is that it marked the mobilization of resources at a local level wherein the political elites have the ability to issue their own coins.

In terms of pre-Sātavāhana chiefs who issued their own coins evidence is available from all sub-regions but it is most striking in the Central Deccan. A significant point to be recognized here is that the dates of these vary from sub-region to sub-region. In this context it has been pertinently pointed out by B.D. Chattopadhyaya that punch-marked coins of the Deccan, which began with the Mauryan period and continued to be manufactured in the early centuries of the Christian era, can in fact, be associated with specific `localities'. These were followed by uninscribed cast coins and uninscribed die-struck coins, and they all provide a necessary background to the emergence of `local' inscribed coin series of the Deccan.[57] P.L. Gupta[58] has made a recent attempt at analyzing these coin series from the numismatic and archaeological point of view to conclude on some of the major issues of their dates and distribution. First and foremost, he has rightly classified the big lead coins with inscriptions issued by local dynasties in the Deccan, sub-region-wise. They are listed as ''Kuras in the Panchgaṅgā basin (Kolhāpur); Sadakaṇas in and around Chitaldurg district; Hastin in the Kṛishṇā valley; an unknown dynasty in the Tuṅgabhadrā basin and Sadas in the Mahishaka country''[59] which, he says, ''existed continuously till they were uprooted by the later Sātavāhanas in the time of Śri Yajña Sātakarṇi or a little earlier in *circa* second-third

centuries AD.''[60] Veerāpuram, Yerraguḍi, Rājulamaṇḍagiri and Chandravalli have been identified as important centres which provide numismatic evidence of the local rulers like Mahāraṭhis and Sadakaṇa rulers.[61] The Kura, Sadakaṇa and Hastin coins are important from the perspective of the Western, Eastern and Southern Deccan as they reveal the political profile of this sub-region after the Mauryan period and before the rise of the Sātavāhanas.

The situation in the Central Deccan is different because of the discovery of several pre-Sātavāhana coins along with early Sātavāhana coins, some of them in a stratified context, at Koṭaliṅgāla.[62] Unlike the other numismatic evidence, the Koṭaliṅgāla finds are outstanding because a number of coins of a certain Chhimuka (25), `founder of the Sātavāhana dynasty', have been collected.[63] Several others of the early rulers of this dynasty like Sātavāhana (234) and Sātakarṇi (47) have also been found.[64] Apart from these, those of Samagopa (68), Mahātalavara (13), Gobhada (17) and Narana (9), open up a new vista of the pre-Sātavāhana history of this region.[65] In our view these clearly highlight the fact thát some form of specific political authority had become a force continuously from pre-Sātavāhana times in the Central Deccan where the Mauryan presence cannot be archaeologically located.[66] There is no doubt, however, that power relations were rooted in old kin ties in post-Mauryan Deccan as a whole. Epigraphic sources from the Eastern Deccan also give us similar evidence as for instance, the mention of Kubiraka *rājā* of the relic casket inscription found at Bhaṭṭiproly of the third century BC, Somaka *rājā* of an inscription of the second century BC found on the outskirts of Vaḍḍamānu, Aira Māna Sada of the Velpūra epigraph and so on.[67] Here coins from Amarāvatī also attest to the existence of local rulers in this sub-region.[68] Even in Sātavāhana times the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions show the existence of local chieftains.[69] Apart from these inscriptional references, in the Western Deccan, sites like Nāsik and Nevāsā have yielded coins datable from third century BC to the second century BC which were die-struck. These two centres have also been identified as important monastic establishments. Some inscribed coins have also been reported from Bhokardan dated to the second century BC.[70] This indicates that some form of political and economic authority had held sway here as in the other sub-regions discussed above.

On the basis of this kind of information on the local power groups in the Deccan, it has been postulated by scholars that the socio-economic changes within these `localities' during the Mauryan period made it possible for them (Mauryas) to acquire a certain level of political authority. The agricultural surplus generated in the precedent megalithic societies must have also been one of the chief factors for generating forces of expansion during the early historic period. In the fertile lower Kṛishṇā valley in the Eastern Deccan, several urban centres have been found associated with Buddhism.

Prominent among these were Amarāvatī, Bhaṭṭiprolu, Chandavaram, Jaggayyapeṭa Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Vaḍḍamānu and Yelleshwaram (Chart III). Inscriptions from Amarāvatī give evidence of powerful individuals and rulers who had made religious donations to the Buddhist monasstic establishments.[71] Further, the mention of chiefs associated with goṣhṭhī[72] or merchant guilds indicates that they must have benefited from the expanding trade activities. In fact, trade and commerce were flourishing in this sub-region even in the pre-Sātavāhana period[73] as is indicated by the existence of early levels of habitation at commercial centres like Guṇṭupalli and Kesarapalli.[74] The evidence for the Western Deccan also shows that there were many centres associated with Buddhism which can be dated to pre-Sātavāhana and early Sātavāhana times. Prominent among those charted out are Ajantā, Aurangābad, Junnar, Nāṇeghāṭ, Nāsik, and Nevāsā (Chart I). Some of these were important commercial centres as well and on the basis of inscriptional evidence from places like Nāsik, Junnar, Kārle and Nāṇeghāṭ, it can be suggested that power was wielded by corporate bodies associated with exchange networks, whereas elsewhere in the Deccan, clan-chiefs were in a dominant position.[75] These locals had also made efforts to ideologically strengthen their control, but in this context it is significant to note that in the Central and Southern Deccan the number of sites associated with Buddhism is small. However, at all the sites in the Central Deccan associated with Buddhism like Dhūlikaṭṭa, Paunī, Ter and Koṇḍāpur (Chart II) there is early evidence of Buddhism. This is also the case in the Southern Deccan at sites like Banavāsī, Brahmagiri and Sannati (Chart IV). Recent researches have now clearly established that trade had affected all aspects of economy in the Deccan, and this went hand in hand with the spread of Buddhist ideology.[76] Therefore, even in the Central and Southern Deccan the above-mentioned early Buddhist centres were located on important trade routes and most of these had significant non-religious material remains indicating that they were important political and commercial centres.

Paiṭhan in the Western Deccan is generally accepted as one of the earliest capitals of the Sātavāhanas. As indicated in the charts, the early Sātavāhana coins have mainly been reported from the Central and Western Deccan at sites like Koṇḍāpur, Hyderābād, Koṭiliṅgāla, Nevāsā, Nāsik, Bhokardan, Paiṭhan and Paunī signifying that these two sub-regions could have been the prominent seats of the early Sātavāhana rule.[77] The concentration of the Sātavāhana rule might have shifted to the Eastern Deccan later,[78] as has been suggested by I.K. Sarma,[78] on the basis of an important mint centre located at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.[79] In any case the Sātavāhana ṛule, at its climax was associated with all the sub-regions of the Deccan, but its beginning in each sub-region was at chronologically different times. Several inscriptions show that the Sātavāhanas began to rule beyond and over parts of the Central and Western Deccan. King Sātakarṇi I of the Sātavāhana dynasty was styled as *Dakshiṇāpathapati*.[80] The Nāsik cave inscription of Queen Balaśrī has mentioned the component parts of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi's empire

as Asika, Asaka, Muḷaka, Suraṭha, Kukura, Aparānta, Anūpa, Vidarbha and Ākara-Avanti.[81] The extent of the Sātavāhana rule has thus been understood to be wide enough to be called empire since they held sway over a large territory.[82] But it is only the nature of its polity that can define its characteristics as an empire. Sātavāhana rule represents in the Deccan for the first time the beginning of an organized set-up in which certain features like a bureaucracy, an organized military, and a well-defined administrative ideology of the State, often represented through religious patronage, significantly emerge.[83] Dakshiṇāpatha has been used to denote the Sātavāhana empire as a whole.[84] The smallest unit of administration seems to have been a village or *grāma*.[85] Towns were the headquarters of the traders of *nigamas* whose associations were called *nigamasabhās*.[86] Mahāraṭhis, Mahābhojas, and Mahātalavaras were common terms used in inscriptions that had been identified with the Sātavāhana rule.[87] In the opinion of R.S. Sharma `Profiting from the experience of the Maurya rule the Sātavāhanas imposed themselves on fairly settled areas studded with several lesser princes and chieftains.'[88] Sātavāhanas, in his view were, therefore, 'A non-Aryan people with matrilineal traditions' and were '...one of the earliest Deccan dynasties to be brahmanised'.[89] He also suggests that the Sātavāhana political structure represents a decentralized bureaucratic administrative system favouring the concept of 'local automony'.[90]

A significant aspect of the Sātavāhana administration was the system of land grants made by the kings with fiscal and administrative immunities to brahmaṇas and Buddhist monks.[91] It has been pointed out that the transfer of fiscal and administrative rights does not seem to have been absolute and permanent. To explain this, R.S. Sharma gives an example of a Sātavāhana inscription which shows that 'a ... village granted to one set of Buddhist monks seems to have been taken away and granted to another by Vāsishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi.'[92] There were social groups involved in the administration of the land granted and for performing different kinds of economic activity. On the basis of the Amarāvatī inscriptions, Ajay Mitra Shastri infers some details of the interaction between royal officers such as army commanders, royal scribes, superintendents of warehouses, caravan-leaders, traders and merchants, treasurers and bankers, overseers of renovation works, artisans, stone workers, perfumers, scribes, cowherds, cobblers, and 'such other people representing a crosss section of the society among those who contributed their mite to the growth of the Buddhist establishment here.'[93]

It has been observed that the economy of the Sātavāhana period in the Deccan as a whole was dependent on three main features viz., plough agriculture, commodity production and trade.[94] While the practice of land grants promoted agriculture, Buddhism seems to have encouraged important trade and commercial activities.[95] This is most clearly apparent in the Western and Eastern Deccan, and as indicated in the

charts, the maximum number of sites with Buddhist remains comes from these two sub-regions (Charts I and III). In fact, many of these monastic sites are dated to as early as the second century BC, while some of them rise only during the early centuries of the Christian era. There is no doubt that port towns and some inland centres in these two sub-regions also rose to prominence during the early centuries AD and this was due to the acceleration of foreign trade under the Sātavāhanas.[96] The *Nigama-sabhās* seem to have organized the trade activities and operated as popular bodies in trade adminisrtration and gift donations to the monasteries.[97] Though numerous epigraphic references mention monks and merchants in different capacities, their contribution to the actual Sātavāhana administration is yet to be established. However, there are several instances of royalty making donations to the Buddhist order. The Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions mention gifts made by kings, queens and princes.[98] The Pitalkhorā inscriptions even record the gifts made by individuals like royal magicians.[99] The Kuḍa and Beḍsā inscriptions record gifts made by merchants and traders.[100] The Junnar inscriptions could be dated to as early as 150 BC and record gifts made by goldsmiths.[101] All these instances go to show that there was general prosperity of social groups involved in craft production and trade. These inscriptions along with those from Amarāvatī mentioned above show the emergence of the Western and Eastern Deccan as two important regions for the trade and religious activities which were evidently reliant on each other and also on other sub-regions.[102] In the Central and Southern Deccan it is revealed that sites with Buddhist remains and monasteries were comparatively fewer (Charts II and IV). However, they were crucial areas for the development of long distance trade and, thus, it is noticed that urban centres here grew in the vicinity of important trade routes.

A regular royal patronage to trade activities and the tolerance towards Buddhism along with a royal eagerness to re-establish *varṇāśrama-dharma*[103] show that certain thought was bastowed by the Sātavāhana rulers to shape the nature of their rule. Thus it is suggested that '...the legal responsibility for maintaining the existing social order thus contributing political stability was first stressed by the Sātavāhanas'[104] in the Deccan. On the other hand, according to H.P. Ray, Sātavāhana rulers were able to recognize the advantages in conceding to the Buddhist ideology which had been responsible for the `protection of trade both overland and overseas'. This had resulted in a symbiotic relationship between the Sātavāhana political structure and the Buddhist order.[105] The royal patronage provided to the expanding trade which was interlinked with the Buddhist ideology, further supported it through institutions like monasteries and quickened the pace of urbanization in early Deccan.[106]

The important feature of the Sātavāhana economy was the ability of the rulers to support areas of prominence for external trade and commerce. These areas interest-

ingly also emerge as important administrative centres. Commercially important places like Broach, Bhokardan, Kauṇḍinyapura, Nāsik, Sopārā, in the Western Deccan, Aḍam, Paunār, Dhūllikaṭṭa, Peddabaṅkūr, Koṇḍāpur and Ter in the Central Deccan, the Amarāvatī-Dharaṇikoṭa complex, Jaggayapeṭa, Bhaṭṭiprolu, Ghanṭasāla, Kesarapalli, Nāgārunakoṇḍa, Sālihuṇḍam, Vaḍḍmānu and Yelleshwaram in the Eastern Deccan, Banavāsī, Brahmagiri, Chandravalli, Sannati, Sātanikoṭa, and Vaḍgaon-Mādhavpur in the Southern Deccan indicate the prosperous nature of urban settlements in all the sub-regions of the Deccan. The form that these took and their distribution pattern in relation to the Buddhist monastic settlements, however, differed from sub-region to sub-region.

The ecologically varied zones provided different kinds of surpluses and revenues to support them. Thus, even though the Western Deccan does not have a large agrarian hinterland, its prosperity rested on its trade links with North and Central India on the one hand, and on the other, its hospitable coast line helped it maintain contact with foreign trade. In one sense the hinterland of the Western Deccan was well beyond the ecologically defined Deccan region. The early contact with North India also meant a substantial influence of Buddhism and this is revealed in the gradual expansion of monastic settlements all along the Western Deccan. In the Eastern Deccan, though Buddhism flourished equally well, its immediate agrarian hinterland in terms of the fertile plains of the Kṛishṇā and Godāvarī delta regions enabled a large number of early historical settlements emerge, and, as Chart III indicates, many of these had no material remains affiliated to Buddhism. However, many of the major Buddhist centres continued to prosper and here in the Eastern Deccan we have some of the largest religious and commercial complexes defining the urbanization of early historic Deccan. In contrast to these two sub-regions, the settlements in the Central Deccan were largely dependent on their ability to produce iron objects. They were located in small agrarian niches of the Waingaṅgā and the mid-Godāvarī valleys. Many of them rose to prominence after the Megalithic phase, and only along trade routes were some of these settlements connected to Buddhist monastic establishments. The Southern Deccan also saw a proliferation of urban settlements, but the stability of some of them was dependent on their location near mineral rich areas. It is for this reason also that we find a continuity of settlements in this sub-region from very early times. New settlements that emerged did so along the river Kṛishṇā and also indicate the influence of Buddhism in their material remains. It is interesting to note that, under the overarching power of the Sātavāhanas, various geographically different zones of the Deccan could be united together while maintaining their particular regional characteristics. Keeping these observations in mind it is important to conclude that it was because of a careful organization of the ecologically varied zones and the maintenance of an inter-link between each of them through economic activity that the Sātavāhanas were able to cement the

various sub-regions of the Deccan for roughly a period of three and a half centuries. Further, it needs to be emphasized that any understanding of the rise of the Sātavāhana State without appreciating the material and socio-economic background to it would lead to an erroneous impresssion that it had an apparently sudden emergence. It is only by taking into account the antecedent cultural phases of habitation which, in the various cultural sub-regionss, were often very different from each other in material and cultural development, that we can appreciate the extent to which the Sātavāhanas played an essentially integrative role in a society which was otherwise still rooted in particular sub-regional economic and material moorings. Buddhism too provided a uniform ideology, but monastic settlements defined the character of urbanization only in some cases.

Notes and References

1. According to Fernand Braudel, one of the factors that State formation is also dependent upon is the geographical location. Quoted in Claessen and Skalnik, *The Early State : Theories and Hypotheses,* The Hague, 1981, p. 37.
2. See for instance the discussion in V.K. Thakur, *Urbanization in Ancient India,* New Delhi, 1981, pp. 25-36; R.S. Sharma, ''Urbanism in Early Historic India'', in Indu Banga (ed.), *The City in Indian History*, New Delhi, 1991, pp. 9-11.
3. We have illustrated this in our paper entitled ``Social Structure and Economy of Settlements in the Central Deccan (200 BC - AD 200)" published in *ibid.,* pp. 19-45. The same appears in *Social Science Probings,* March-December, 1988, pp. 1-19.
4. K. Gopalachari, *Early History of the Andhra Country,* Madras, 1941; Y. Balarama Murthy, *Andhrula Saṅkshipta Charitra* (Telugu), Vijayawada (rp.), 1981 (First published in 1953); Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya, *Some Early Dynasties of South India,* Delhi, 1974; G. Yazdani (ed), *The Early History of the Deccan,* New Delhi (rp), 1982 (First published in 1960); K.A.N. Sastri, *A History of South India : From Pre-Historic Times to the Fall of Vijayanagar,* Madras (rp), 1987.
5. A brief discussion on the same can be found in a chapter on the origins of government in Elman R. Service, *Origins of State and Civilisation – The Process of Cultural Evolution,* New York, 1975, pp. 10-20. Most pertinently see the definitions in V.G. Childe, ''Civilization, Cities and Towns'', *Antiquity*, Vol. 31, March 1957, p. 36, which is elaborated by him in *What Happened in History* (first published 1942), Penguin Books (rp.), 1964, pp. 31-32, 97ff.
6. The books that have favoured the shorter chronology include, Ajay Mitra Shastri (ed.), *Coinage of the Sātavāhanas and Coins from* Excavations, Nagpur, 1972, pp. 103-9; H.P. Ray, *Monastery and Guild : Commerce under the Sātavāhanas,* Bombay, 1986, p. 2; Ajay Mitra Shastri, *EHDPP*, p. 3. The works that have supported the longer chronology are I.K. Sarma, *The Coinage of Sātavāhana Empire,* New Delhi, 1980, p. 10; G. Yazdani (ed.), *op. cit.,* 1982, p. 90.

7. Recent work done on the basis of the numismatic evidence, has reinforced the shorter chronology of the Sātavāhanas; for example, Ajay Mitra Shastri, *op. cit.*, 1987, p. 3 and P.V.P. Sastry's new book, *Sātavāhana Epoch, A New Light*, Telugu Goshti, Hyderabad, 1994.
8. Location of Aśokan inscriptions recently mapped out by Gerrad Fussman, ''Central and Provincial Administration in Ancient India: The Problem of the Mauryan Empire'', *IHR*, Vol. XIV, Nos. 1-2, 1987-88, pp. 47, 64-67.
9. This has been done by us in an article with a focus on the Central and Southern Deccan. *Vide* ''Nature of Society and Civilization in Early Deccan'', *IESHR*, Vol. 29, 4, 1992, pp. 448-70.
10. S. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India, c. 250 BC - AD 300*, Delhi, 1981 on the Western Deccan and Amita Ray, *Life and Art of Early Andhra Deśa*, Delhi, 1983 on the Eastern Deccan have taken up the study of the relationship of art and the growth of Buddhism against the backdrop of the rise of early historic trade. The singular most important book in this regard is the more recent publication: H.P. Ray, *op. cit.*, 1986.
11. Aloka Parasher, *op. cit.*, 1992, pp. 464, 473-75.
12. For South India in general views of M.G.S. Narayanan in his book on *Re-interpretations on South Indian History*, Trivandrum, 1977; for Eastern Deccan, Sudarshan Seneviratne, ''Kalinga and Andhra : The Process of Secondary State Formation'', *IHR*, vol. 7, no. i-ii, 1981, pp. 54-70; for Western Deccan, H.P. Ray, *op. cit.*, 1986; for Central Deccan, Aloka Parasher, ''Social Structure and Economy of Settlements in the Central Deccan (200 BC – AD 200)'' in Indu Banga (ed.), *op. cit.*, 1990, pp. 19-47 and *op. cit.*, 1992, pp. 437-77.
13. In the early 1950s D.H. Gordon suggested this but later changed his mind. However, he maintained the view that iron was brought to India by 'a people who buried their dead in cairns'. Discussed in B.R. Subrahmanyam, ''Appearance and Spread of Iron in India —An Appraisal of Archaeological Data,'' *JOI*, vol. XIII, no. 1, Sept. 1963, pp. 351-53.
14. N.R. Banerjee, *The Iron Age in India*, New Delhi, 1965, p. 214. Earlier views that the first evidence of iron working can be observed only in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā doāb and then 'the knowledge diffused to other parts of the sub-continent' is no longer accepted. For earlier views, Cf. Subramanyan, *op. cit.*, 1963, p. 357.
15. F.R. Allchin, *The Rise of Civilization in India and Pakistan*, New Delhi, 1983, p. 334.
16. M.S. Nagaraja Rao, *Protohistoric Cultures of the Tungabhadra Valley*, Poona, 1971, pp. 123, 136.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 49. M.S. Nagaraja Rao is of the opinion that megalithic people settled on riverine beds in the Southern Deccan. For details on different aspects of the socio-economic life of the megalithic period in South India and the Deccan, see B.K. Gururaja Rao, *Megalithic Culture in South India*, Mysore, 1972, Chapters 10 and 12; K.P. Rao, *Deccan Megaliths*, Delhi, 1988.
18. Dilip K. Chakravarti, ''The Issues of the Indian Iron Age'', in S.B. Deo and K. Paddayya (eds.), *Recent Advances in Indian Archaeology*, Deccan College, Poona, 1985, p. 76.

19. Anna King, ''Some Archaeological Problems Regarding Gangetic Cultures in Early Historical India'', in K.A.R. Kennedy and G.L. Possehl (eds.), *Studies in Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology of South Asia,* American Institute of Indian Studies, 1984, pp. 110-11.
20. G. Erdosy, *Urbanization in Early Historic India,* BAR International Series, 430, 1988, pp. 2 and 4. A small attempt at looking at the relationship between different types of settlements at a sub-regional level of the mid-Godāvarī valley and defining the possible nature of their urban characteristics has been made in Aloka Parasher, *op. cit.,* 1991, pp. 19-46.
21. A study of the pottery traits of these cultures significantly suggests a possible cultural contact between both these two sub-regions. See B. Subba Rao, *The Personality of India,* Baroda, 1958, p. 115.
22. M.K. Dhavalikar, ''Daimabad – A Rediscovery'', *Purātattva,* no. 3, 1969-70, p. 42; ''Cultural Ecology of Chalcolithic Maharashtra'' in S.B. Deo & K. Paddayya (eds.), *op. cit.,* 1985, p. 68.
23. M.K. Dhavalikar, *ibid.,* p. 69. Sali's comments on M.K. Dhavalikar's views, *ibid.,* p. 70. Shereen Ratnagar, ''A Chalcolithic Village in a Famine Belt'' (Review Article), *Studies in History* (New Series), vol. 5, no. 2, 1989, pp. 287-302.
24. S.B. Deo, *Problems of South Indian Megaliths,* Dharwar, 1973, pp. 20-42; V.V. Krishna Sastry, *The Proto and Early Historical Cultures of Andhra Pradesh,* Hyderabad, 1983, pp. 22, 115, 125-28.
25. M.S. Nagaraja Rao, *op. cit.,* 1971, pp. 1, 49.
26. C. Maloney, ''Archaeology in South India : Accomplishments and Prospects'' in Burton Stein (eds.), *Essays on South India,* Delhi, 1976, pp. 8-9. Though this early evidence is limited, Maloney is of the opinion that the spread of iron technology in general can be understood to have great implications for the diffusion of an agricultural economy based on rice cultivation. He further suggests a diffusion of rice cultivation and the Dravidian languages with the Megaliths. B.K. Thapar, ''Maski – 1954 : Chalcolithic Site of the Southern Deccan'', *AI,* No. 13, pp. 14-15. Deo, on the other hand, argues on the basis of the evidence mainly from the Vidarbha sites and also from Brahmagiri and Maskī that the Megalithic people were mainly pastrolists, *op. cit.,* 1985, pp. 90-91, 94. N.R. Banerjee, *op. cit.,* 1965, p. 210, gives emphasis to the role played by irrigation in agriculture in the megalithic society.
27. M.S. Nagaraja Rao, *op. cit.,* p. 15. See also M.S. Nagaraja Rao, ''Earliest Iron-Using People in India and the Megaliths'' in *Madhu : Recent Researches in Indian Archaeology and Art History,* 1981, pp. 25-32. In the latter article he discusses evidence from Tadakanahall, a site 8 km from Hallūr, which shows that the Megalithic burials are related to the overlap phase of Neolithic-Chalcolithic and Early Iron Age at Hallūr. Pottery and iron tool types are similar at both places. This evidence is therefore suggested to be the earliest evidence for Megalithic burials datable to *c.* 1000 BC. It nonetheless needs to be pointed out that D.P. Agarwal feels that further confirmation about the antiquity of iron in South India is necessary—*The Archaeology of India,* London, 1982, p. 257.

28. V.V. Krishna Sastry, *op. cit.*, 1983, pp. 22, 24, 35, 95-97.

29. *Ibid.*, pp. 94-97, 115. Pochampāḍu and perhaps Kadambapur, are most representative of megalithic sites in this region. Kṛishṇa Sastry has noted that both of them have burial furniture in conformity with that of the Vidarbha regin.

30. Currently serious efforts at understanding the iron ores and technology of ''Deccani 'wootz' production'' are being made by Thelma Lowe. For details, see the following papers by her : (1) ''Refractories in High-Carbon Processing : A Preliminary Study of the Deccan Wootz-Making Crucibles'' in P.E. McGovern and M.D. Notis (eds.), *Cross-Craft and Cross-Cultural Interactions in Ceramics*, American Ceramic Society, Westerville OH, 1989, pp. 237-51; (2) ''Solidification and the Crucible Processing of Deccan Ancient Steel" in R. Trivedi, J.A. Sekhar and J. Mazumdar (eds.), *Principles of Solidification and Materials Processing*, vol. 2, Oxford and IBH, New Delhi, 1989, pp. 729-39; (3) ''Indian Iron Ores and the Technology of Deccani 'Wootz' Production'' presented at the *Iron Palaeometallurgy and Cultures International Symposium*, Universite de Technologies de Compiegne a Sevenans, Belfort, November 1-3, 1990, pp. 1-12.

31. Krishna Sastry, *op. cit.*, 1983, p. 107.

32. SB. Deo, ''Megaliths : Their Culture, Ecology, Economy and Technology'' in S.B. Deo & K. Paddayya (eds.), *op. cit.*, Poona, 1985, p. 90.

33. Various megalithic activities have been amply elaborated in different site reports and books. For example, in M.S. Nagaraja Rao, *op. cit.*, 1977, p. 123 – domestication of animals and cultivation have been elaborately discussed. On page 136 of the same report, fishing activities have been hypothesized on the basis of the finding of a copper fish hook. In Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, an industry of Red and Black Ware pottery has been identified in R. Subrahmanyam, *Nāgarjunakoṇḍa I*, New Delhi, 1975, p. 195. Allchin also elaborately discusses the various megalithic craft activities like making of iron tools, iron domestic implements, pottery making etc. in *op. cit.*, 1983, pp. 334-39.

34. Kṛishṇa Sastry, *op. cit.*, 1983, p. 106.

35. S.B. Deo, *op. cit.*, 1985, p. 90. Kṛishṇa Sastry, *op. cit.*, 1983, p. 106, points to the proximity of irrigation tanks near megalithic burials in the Karīmnagar region.

36. Vishnu Mittre, ''Ancient Plant Economy at Hallur'' in M.S. Nagaraja Rao, *op. cit.*, 1971, p. 129; A. Sundara, *Early Chamber Tombs in South India*, Delhi, 1975, p. 220.

37. Many megalithic monuments suggesting irrigational activities and constructions of domestic and burial complexes have been identified in Central Deccan at sites like Peddabankūr, Chinnamarrūr, Ṭākalghāt, Khāpa. –For details, see V.V. Krishna Sastry, *op. cit.*, 1983, pp. 53-55, 105; K.P. Rao, *op. cit.*, 1988, pp. 38-41, 43-47, 49-51.

38. Sudarshan Seneviratane, *op. cit.*, 1981, pp. 54, 57, 59.

39. Two sub-regions which can be contrasted in terms of the rise of settlements and their relationship to the spread of iron technology are the Central and the Western Deccan. Whereas in the former the rise of early historical settlements is closely related to it, at the

latter there is no visible connection, but there is a similar rise of early historical settlements. Both these do not have the ecological environment for large-scale agrarian expansion.

40. R.G. Bhandarkar, *The Early History of the Dekkan*, 1895; Nilakanta Sastri adheres to the same views. For details, *op. cit.*, 1987, p. 68.

41. I.K. Sarma, ''Amaravati Stūpamu – Neti Purāvastu Parisodhanalu'' (Telugu) in *Bharatī*, August, 1975, p. 16; I.K. Sarma, ''Early Sculptures and Epigraphs from South-East India: New Evidence from Amarāvati'', in Frederick M. Asher and G.S. Gai (eds.), *Indian Epigraphy, its Bearing on the History of Art*, New Delhi, 1985, pp. 15-16.

42. I.K. Sarma, *op. cit.*, 1975, p. 16.

43. Vimala Begley, ''From Iron Age to the Early Historical in South Indian Archaeology,'' in Jerome Jacobson (ed.), *Studies in Archaeology of India and Pakistan*, New Delhi, 1986, pp. 303-4.

44. I.K. Sarma, *op. cit.*, 1975, pp. 23-24.

45. M. Wheeler, ''Brahmagiri and Chandravalli, 1947 : Megalithic and Other Cultures in the Chitaldurg District, Mysore State,'' *AI*, no. 4, 1947-48, pp. 180-310; Maloney, *op. cit.*, 1976, pp. 25-26; Vimala Begley, *op. cit.*, 1986, pp. 304, 306.

46. *Ibid.*, 1986, p. 301.

47. I.K. Sarma, ''Some Early Telugu Inscriptions'' in *EA*, vol. IV, p. 1.

48. I.K. Sarma, ''Nagarjunakonda Tavvakāllo Dorikina Nanem Accuhmukka'' (Telugu) in *Bhāratī*, 1971, p. 12.

49. I.K. Sarma, *op. cit.*, 1975, p. 17.

50. Romila Thapar, *The Mauryas Revisited*, New Delhi, 1987, p. 13.

51. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

52. Seneviratne, *op. cit.*, 1981, p. 60.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

54. Begley, *op. cit.*, 1986, p. 304.

55. V.V. Krishna Sastry, ''Archaeological Discoveries in AP'' in B.K. Gururaja Rao (ed.), *A Decade of Archaeological Discoveries in South India*, Dharwar, 1978, p. 74; P.L. Gupta (*op. cit.*, 1990, p. 306) hopes that the publication of the Koṭalingāla report would reveal much of the knowledge we need of this period and may add to the existing limited information known from the Nevāsā excavations. He is of the firm opinion that the origin of the Sātavāhanas lay in the northern part of the Deccan and not in its southern or eastern parts. Pre-Sātavāhana levels from excavations have also been reported in this region from Vadlūru in Nizāmābād district and Polakoṇḍa from Wārangal district—Krishna Sastry, *op. cit.*, 1983, pp. 129-30.

56. *Ibid.*, pp. 94, pp. 126, 244, 218-19; Amita Ray, *op. cit.*, 1983, p. 86. At Peddabankūr, Black and Red Ware and Red and Coarse Red is also found.

57. B.D. Chattopadhyaya, *op. cit.*, 1987, p. 729.

58. ''Coins from Archaeological Excavations in Deccan'', paper presented and circulated at the *Colloquium on South Indian Archaeology,* Birla Archaelogical and Cultural Research Institute, Hyderabad, January 19-21, 1990, pp. 237-310.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 305.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 306.

61. T.V.G. Sastry, M. Kasturi Bai & J. Vara Prasada Rao, *Veerapuram – A Type Site for Cultural Study in the Kṛishṇā Valley*, Hyderabad, 1984, p. 98; P.L. Gupta, *op. cit.*, 1990, p. 271. Mahāraṭhi coins have been found at Kotaliṅgāla as well – *ibid.*, p. 271.

62. Thakur Raja Ram Singh, ''The Pre-Sātavāhana Andhra Kings – A Fresh Study'' *Journal of Archaeology*, vol. III, No. 2, 1995, pp. 20-21.

63. Kṛishṇa Sastry, *op. cit.*, 1983, pp. 126 and 132; P.L. Gupta, ''Koṭalingāla Find of Post-Mauryan Coins'', *ND*, vol. II, pt. ii, December 1978, pp. 31-32, does not agree with the view that Chhimuka was the same as Simuka and should be considered as the progenitor of the Sātavāhana family.

64. T.R.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, 1987, pp. 22-23.

65. Parabhrama Sastry, ''Coins of Simuka Sātavāhana Discovered'', *JAAP*, vol. I, no. 1, 1979, pp. 136-37; T.R.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, 1987, p. 22-23.

66. P.L. Gupta *(op. cit.*, 1978, p. 33) clearly postulates that these rulers should be simply considered local rulers of the Karīmnagar region who, like the Kura and Sadakana rulers of other regions of the Deccan, became powerful after the decline of the Mauryas.

67. The correct reading of the king's name is Mahasada. *Vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, ''On the Velpūru Pillar Inscription of Mahāsada'', *JESI*, XIX, 1992, pp. 13-18 – Ed. P.V. Parabrahma Sastry, ''Political System in Early Coastal Andhra'', in Devendra Handa (ed.), *Ajaya Śri, Recent Studies in Indology,* Delhi, 1989, pp. 71-72. Parabrahma Sastry writes that ''Regarding the political activity in Andhra Pradesh during the pre-Sātavāhana period ...the information is too meagre to reconstruct any dynastic history.'' Though this may be true from the point of view of writing traditional dynastic history, for our present concern, the above evidence from all the sub-regions of the Deccan throws valuable light on the transition from the preliterate to the literate early historical stage emphasizing on the internal dynamics of the assertion of politico-economic power.

68. Jas Burgess, *Reports on the Buddhist Cave Temples and Their Inscriptions*, London, 1883, p. 84.

69. I.K. Sarma, *op. cit.*, 1983, pp. 9-10.

70 Ajay Mistra Smith in S.B. Deo & R.S. Gupta, *Excavations At Bhokardan* 1973, Nagpur-Aurangabad, 1974, p. 19.

71. Amita Ray, *op.cit.*, 1983, pp. 9-10.

72. H.P. Ray, *op. cit.*, 1989, p. 106.

73. Amita Ray, *op. cit.*, 1983, p. 100.
74. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.
75. H.P. Ray, *op. cit.*, 1989, p. 106.
76. James Heitzman, ''Early Buddhism, Trade and Empire,'' in K.A.R. Kennedy & Gregory L. Posshel (eds.), *op. cit.*, 1984, pp. 121-33.
77. *ARDAM*, Andhra Pradesh, 1981-82, p. 1; Ajay Mitra Shastri in S.B. Deo & R.S. Gupte, *op. cit.*, 1974, p. 19; H.D. Sankalia & S.B. Deo, *Excavations at Nasik and Jorwe*, Poona, 1955, pp. 7, 20; *IAR* 1955-56, pp. 8-11; *ibid*, 1965-66, pp. 28-29; I.K. Sarma, *op. cit.*, 1980, p. 38.
78. *Ibid*, pp. 33, 38. *Vide* also A.M. Shastri, *The Sātavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas : A Historical Framework*, Nagpur, 1998.
79. I.K. Sarma, p. cit., 1971, p. 9.
80. B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao, *op. cit.*, 1983, p. 63. But in reality there was only one powerful Sātakarṇi among the early *Sātavāhanas – Ed.*
81. E. Senart, ''The Inscriptions in Caves at Nasik'', *EI*, vol. VIII, 1905-6, p. 61.
82. Romila Thapar, *op. cit.*, 1987, p. 4.
83. Some scholars suggest it to be a feudal polity, e.g. K.C. Gairola, ''The Administrative Structure of the Sātavāhana Empire'', *Arts and Letters*, vol. XXIX, no. 2, 1955, p. 42.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
85. *Ibid.*
86. *Ibid.*
87. A.H. Siddiqui, ''A Copper Seal of Mahāraṭhi Aśvaghosha'', in *ND*, vol. II, 1977, p. 94; Jas Burgess, *Reports on Elura Cave Temples and Brahmanical Jaina Caves in Western India*, London, 1883, p. 64.
88. R.S. Sharma, *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, New Delhi (rp.) 1968, p. 201.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 201. But the Sātavāhanas were not matriarchal as the succession was from father to son – Ed.
90. *Ibid.*, pp. 203, 215.
91. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
93. Ajay Mitra Shastri, *op. cit.*, 1987, p. 104.
94. K. Satyanarayana, *op. cit.*, 1985, p. 113.
95. *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 94.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
97. R.S. Sharma, *op. cit.*, 1968, p. 203.

98. Jas Burgess, *op. cit.*, 1883, pp. 59-70.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
100. Ibid., pp. 85, 89.
101. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
102. Aloka Parasher, *op. cit.*, 1991, pp. 19-47.
103. Jas Burgess, *op. cit.*, 1983, p. 109. There are also Vedic sacrifices mentioned in inscriptions as at Nāṇeghāṭ. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
104. R.S. Sharma, *op. cit.*, 1968, p. 214.
105. H.P. Ray, *op. cit.*, 1989, p. 106.
106. J. Heitzman (*op. cit.*, 1986, pp. 132-33) has suggested this interconnection for the whole of India since the Mauryan times.

Key to Charts

B	Buddhist Monuments
C	Chalcolithic Phase
CM	A Chalcolithic and Megalithic Site
E	Early Historic Phase
H	A Megalithic Habitation Site
I	Evidence of an Iron Age
In	Various Types of Inscriptions
LN	Lower Neolithic Phase
M	Mauryan Remains
MA	Aśokan Inscriptions
MAE	A Megalithic and Early Historic Site
ME	Mesolithic Phase
NC	A Neolithic Chalcolithic Site
NCIE	A Neolithic, Chalcolithic, Iron Age and Early Historic Site
NCM	A Neolithic, Chalcolithic and Megalithic Site
NI	A Neolithic and Iron Age Site
NIE	A Neolithic, Iron Age and Early Historic Site
NM	A Neolithic and Megalithic Site
NR	Primarily a Non-Religious Site
OC	Only a Chalcolithic Site
OE	Only an Early Historic Site
OM	Only a Megalithic Site

PNR	Primarily a Pre-Satavahana Non-Religious Site
PM@	Punch-marked Coins
PRE	A Pre-Satavahana and a Religious Site
PRNR	A Pre-Satavahana and both a Religious and a Non-Religious Site
R	Evidence of Roman Finds
RE	Primarily a Religious Site
RENR	Both a Religious and a Non-Religious Site
T	Significant Non-Religious Structures or Material Remaings
UN	Upper Neolithic Phase
@	Various Types of Coins
#	Megalithic Burial Site
*	No Clear Date Available

Chart I*

Western Deccan
(Sub-region A)

Site/District	Up to 6th BC	c. 3rd cen. BC	200 BC-0 BC	0 AD - 300 AD	Code	Reference
AJANTA Aurangabad	–	–	B	B	RE	*HPR*, pp. 31, 66, 82; *EBRT*, pp. 84, 148, 158
AKOLA Aurangabad	–	–	@ T	@ T	NR	*IAR*, 1955-56, 1967-68; CTS, p. 38
AURANGABAD Aurangabad	–	–	B	B	RE	*EBRT*, p. 158
BAHAL Jalgaon	C I	NBP	PM @ T	PM @ T	PNR	*IAR*, 1956-57, pp. 17-18, 19
BEDSA Poona	–	–	B	B	RE	*HPR*, pp. 73-74, 88
BHAJA Poona	–	–	B	B	RE	*EBRT*, pp. 153, 54; *HPR*, p. 73, 87, 207, 209

BHARUCH – Bharuch		T NBP	TP @	TP @	PNR	*IAR*, 1958-59, p. 69, 1959-60, p. 19; *HPR*, pp. 57-59, 128-29
BHOKARDAN – Aurangabad		PM@ T NBP@ TR		@ TR	PNR	*EB*, pp. 1, 7-8, 10, 18-19, 75, 104, 211, *IAR*, 1973- 74, pp. 20-21
BRAHMAPURI – Kolhapur		@	@ T	@ T	PNR	*EBP*, p. 61; *HPR*, pp. 45-46, 49, 156
CHANDOLI Poona	C	–	–	–	OC	CC, pp. 3, 15
CHAUL Konkan	–	–	TP	TP	NR	SS, pp. 48-49; *HPR*, pp.18, 61-62
DAIMABAD Ahmadnagar	NC	–	–	–	OC	*IAR*, 1958-59, p. 15, 1979-80, pp. 34-35; Pur. 3, 1969-70, p. 35
INAMGAON Poona	C	–	–	–	OC	*IAR*, 1969-70, p. 27; Pur. 1975-76, p. 44
JORWE Ahmadnagar	C	–	–	–	OC	*ENJ*, p. 7; p. 150; IAR, 1958-59, p. 15
JUNNAR Poona	–	–	@ B In	@ B In	RENR	*JNSI*, 38, 1976, pp. 6-11; SS, p. 47; *HPR*, pp. 21, pp. 72-73, pp. 102, 195
KANEHERI Konkan	–	–	–	TB In	RENR	*IAR*, 1969-70, p. 22; *HPR*, pp. 18, 61-62
KARADHA Satara	–	–	BT	BT	RENR	*EBRT*, p. 183; *HPR*, pp. 74, 83, 132
KARLE Poona	–	–	B In	B In	RE	*EI*, VII, 1902-3 p. 64-65; *HPR*, pp. 65, 73-74, 88
KAUNDINYAPURA #*		M PM @ NBP I @ TF		I @ TF	PNR	*EAK*, 1968, pp. 86, 92, 94, 104, 135: *IAR*, 1961-2, pp. 29-30

KONDANE Poona	–	–	B	B	RE	*EBRT*, pp. 153 55
KONDIVTE Konkan	–	–	B	B	RE	*HPR*, pp. 61, 87
KUDA Konkan				B In	RE	*HPR*, pp. 188, 63, 88
MAHAD Konkan	–	–	–	B	RE	*HPR*, pp. 18, 63, 88
MANDHAL Nagpur	–	–	–	@ TR	NR	*IAR*, 1970-71, pp. 24; 1973-74, pp. 36; *SS*, pp. 50-51
NADSUR Poona	–	–	B	B	RE	*EBRT*, pp. 83, 153-55; *HPR*, pp. 73-74
NANEGHAT Poona	–	–	B In	B In	RE	*EHDY*, p. 120; SEL, No. 82; *HPR*, pp. 36, 83
NASIK Nasik	C NBP	PM @ T	@ B T R In	@ B T R In *PRN*		*ENJ*, pp. 7, 19-29; SEL, Nos. 83, 84, 86, 87, EI, VIII, pp. 59-96; *HPR*, 71-72
NAVDATOLI West Nimar	LN C	–	@ B In	@ B In	RENR	*RCIP*, p. 267; *EMN*, pp. 51-53; *CN*, pp. 323-33; *HPR*, p. 65
NEVASA Ahmadnagar	UNC NBP I	PM@ NBP B	PM@ T R	PM@ @ T R PNR		*IAR*, 1954-55, pp. 8-11; 1959-60, pp. 25, 28, 1960-61, p. 21; *HPN*, pp. 69, 161
PAITHAN Aurangabad	–	NBP	@T Ic	@ T	NR	*IAR*, 1965-66, pp. 28-29; SS, pp. 5-6; *HPR*, p. 68-69, 84-85; *EHD*, p. 138.
PITALKHORA Aurangabad	–	–	B	B	RE	*HPR*, p. 66, 187; *EBRT*, pp. 83, 119, 156
PRAKASH Dhule	N C I NBP	NBP T	@T	T	PNR	*AI*, 20 & 21, 1967, pp. 5, 8-9, 12-24, 105.

SOPARA Thane	–	MA	TPF	@ TPF B	RENR	*HPR*, pp. 17-18, 31, 59-60, 63-64, 82-83; *SS*, pp. 48-49
TEKWADA Jalgaon	C	–	–	–	OC	*IAR*, 1956-57, p. 18; Pur. 1968-69, p. 35.

CHART II
CENTRAL DECCAN
(Sub-region B)

Site/District	Up to 6th BC	c. 3rd cen. BC	200 BC-0 BC	0 AD 300 AD	Code	Reference
ADAM Nagpur	ME C I	M PM @	@ TF R	@ B TF R	PRNR	*IAR*, 1975-6, p. 36, 1987-88, pp. 84-87; *AVA*, pp. 79
69-ARNI Yeotmal	#*	M T NBP	@ T R	@ T R	PNR	*IAR*, 1978-79, p. 71, *SS*, p. 51
BHAGI MAHARI-Nagpur	–	#*	#* E*	–	OM	*HPR*, pp. 50
BUDIGAPALLY Karimnagar	#* H*	#* H*	E*	E*	MAE	*IAR* 1962-3, p. 65, 1976-77, p. 3, *PEHC*, p. 125, 127
CHAGTUR Mahboobnagar	C	#* H*	–	–	CM	*IAR*, 1978-79 pp. 9-11
CHINNABANKUR-Karimnagar	–	–	E T*	E T*	OE	SS, p. 3, *PEHC*, pp.125, 240
DHULIKATTA Karimnagar	–	B	B @ TF R In	@ TFR In	PRNR	*IAR*, 1974-75, pp.3, 1975-76, pp.2-3, 1976-7, pp. 4-5, *PEHC*, pp. 124-26
HASHMAPET 8, Ranga Reddy	–	–	I#	I#	OM	*REMBH*, pp. 5, 12, *IAR*, 1973-74, p. 4, *DM*, p. 22
KADAMBAPUR	N #* H*	#* H*	–	–	NM	*IAR*, 1962-63, p. 65; *ARAP*, 1974-75, pp. 5-6; *DM*, p. 32; *PEHC*, pp. 25-26

KAPPARAOPET – Karimnagar	–	E*	E*	OE	*PEHC*, pp. 125, 127-28
KARIMNAGAR – Karimnagar	–	@ E*	E*	OE	*IAR*, 1977-78, p. 73
KARNAMAMIDI – Adilabad	–	E T*	E T*	OE	*PEHC*, pp. 127-28, 240; SS, p. 3
KHĀPĀ #H Nagpur	–	–	–	OM	*ETK*, p. 6; *DM*, p. 26
KOKĀPET #* Ranga Reddy	#*	–	–	OM	*PEHC*, pp. 125, 127-28, 240
KOLAKONDA #* H* Karimnagar	#* H*	E*	E*	MAE	PEHC, pp. 125, 127-28, 240
KONDAPUR PM@ Medak	PM@	PM@ B T R	B @ T R In	PRNR	*ABORI*, XII, 1941, p. 175ff, *ARAP*, 1940-41, pp. 16-18
KOTALINGĀLA – Karimnagar	@	@ TF In	@ TF	PNR	*ARAP*, 1981-82, pp. 19-21, *PEHC*, pp. 125-26, 132.
NAIKUṆḌ I#* Nagpur	I#*	–	–	OM	*IAR*, 1962-63, p. 66, 1977-78, p. 39.
PAUNĀR #* Wardhā	–	@T	T	NR	*PAEX*, 1967, pp. 7, 9, 11-12, 115; PEHC, pp. 115-16
PAUNĪ #* Bhaṇḍārā	NBP B @	@ B	@ B	PRE	*IAR*, 1969-70, pp. 20-21; *SS*, p. 50, *PAUE*, pp. 25-30, 84, 117.
PEDDABANKUR N Karimnagar	N#HT In	N PM@ @ T R	PM@ In	@ T R PNR	*ARAP*, 1970-71, p. 2, 1974-5, p. 5; *PEHC*, p. 24, 26, 104; *DM*, p. 44
POCHAMPĀḌU I* #* Nizamabad	#*	–	–	OM	*IAR*, 1963-64, p. 1; *DM*, p. 23; *PEHC*, pp. 82, 95-97
POLAKONḌĀ LN UN # H Warangal	I* #* H*	@T	@T	MAE	*IAR*, 1975-64, p. 1; *DM*, P. 23; *PEHC*, p. 82, 95-7

ṬĀKALAGHĀṬ # H Nagpur	–	–	–	OM		*IAR*, 1975-76, p. 5; *ETK*, p. 4; *PEHC*, pp. 22, 27, 129.
TER Osmānābāḍ	–	NBP @	@ B T R	@ B T R	PRNR	*IAR*, 1966-67, pp. 25-26, 1967-68, p. 35, 1968-69, p. 17; *RET*, pp. 18-20
UPPALAPĀḌU Kurnool	I* H*	I*	–	–	OM	*IAR*, 1977-78, p. 12; *DM*, p. 51
UṬNŪR Mahboobnagar	LN UN I	–	–	–	NI	*BIC*, pp. 163-169; *UE*, pp. 42, 74, 127, 129

CHART III
EASTERN DECCAN
(Sub-region C)

Site/District	Up to 6th BC	c. 3rd Cen. BC	200 BC-0 BC	0 AD - 300 AD	Code	Reference
ADURRU East Godavari	I*	I*	E* B	E* B	RENR	*IAR*, 1962-63, pp. 5, 65, 1976-77, p. 3
AGIRIPALLI Kṛishṇa	UN*	I* #*	–	–	NM	*IAR*, 1969-70, p. 1, 1976-77, p.5
AMARAVATI Guṇṭur	N* I* #*	NBP B M In @ B R In		@ B T In	PRNR	*AAHST*, p. 2; *IAR*, 1973-74, p.4; *R E M B H*, pp. 5, 8, 12, *HPR*, p. 42, *DM*, p. 45
BHAṬṬIPROḶU Guṇṭur	–	–	B In E*	–	RE	*JA*, pp. 70-77; *SEL*, p. 227
CHANDAVARAM Prakāsam	–	–	I* E*	@ B R		*R E N R* *IA R*, 1974-75, p. 6, 1975-76, pp. 3-4, *ARAP*, 1972-73, p. 13
CHINTALAPĀḌU Kṛishṇa		–	E*	E*	OE	*VEKV*, pp. 36-37

DHARAṆIKOṬA Guṇṭur	I#	# NBP	TF	@ TF R	PNR	*IAR*, 1962-64, pp. 1-2, p. 2-4, 1964-66, p. 2-3, 86; *JIH*, LII, p. 49f.
EṬURU Kṛishṇa	–	–	E*	E*	OE	*VEKV*, pp. 39-40
GUḌIMELLANKA East Godāvari	I* #* h	#* h	E*	E*	MAE	*IAR*, 1962-63, p. 65; *ARAP*, 1974-75, pp. 3, 5-6; *DM*, p. 25
JAGGAYYAPEṬA Kṛishṇa	I* #* h	–	B R	–	RENR	*DM*, p. 26
KANUKOLLU Kṛishṇa	I* H	–	–	–	OM	*IAR*, 1962-63, pp. 66-67
KESARAPALLI Kṛishṇa	CI #* H	NBP	R	@T	PNR	*AI*, 22, Kṛishṇa pp. 40, 43, 46; *IAR*, 1961-62, pp. 1-2
KONDĀPEṬA Kṛishṇa	N*	–	E*	E*	OE	*VEKV*, pp. 28-35
KUḌAVELLI Mahboobnagar	–	–	–	BTR	RENR	*IAR*, 1978-79, pp. 37-39
NĀGĀRJUNAKOṆḌA Guṇṭur	N C I*	B	@BTR In	@ BTR In	PRNR,	NK pp. 81, 101, 105, 130, 165, 195; *AI*, 1960, p. 65
PAGIDIGUṬṬĀ Mahboobnagar	C* I*	I*	E*	E*	MAE	*IAR*, 1978-79 p. 65
PEDDAMARRUR Mahboobnagar	I* H*	I* H*	#*	E* T	MAE	IAR, 1977-78, p. 12; *DM*, p. 50
PUSALAPADU Kṛishṇa	N* I*	I*	–	–	NI	*IAR*, 1962-63, p. 67
RĀJULAMAṆḌAGIRI East Godāvarī	–	MA	E*	BR	PRNR	IAR 1953-54, p. 13;1979-80, p. 1; 1980-81, pp. 1-2
SĀLIHUṆḌAM Śrīkākulam	–	B	PM@ @ BR	@ B T R In	PRNR	T.R. Subramanyam, *Śalihuṇdam*, pp. 7-9

SINGANAPALLI C* Kurnool	–	–	–	OC		*IAR*, 1967-8 p. 3
VAḌḌAMĀṆU – Guntur	NBP	@ B In	@ B In	PRNR		*VEKV*, pp. 4-5, 8, 20
YELEŚWARAM – Nalgoṇḍā	–	I#	@ B TF R	RENR		*AMYE*, pp. 4, 9-11

CHART IV
SOUTHERN DECCAN
(Sub-region D)

Site/District	Up to 6th BC	c. 3rd cen. BC	200 BC - 0 BC	0 AD - 300 AD	Code	Reference
BANAVĀSI North Kanārā	-	M B PM@	@* B* T* R*	@ BTR In	PRNR	*IAR*, 1968-69, p. 47, 1970-71, pp. 28-29, *SS*, pp. 34-35, 42; *Pur.* 4, p. 56
BRAHMAGIRI Chitaldurg	LNUN C I#*	# MA	@ B TF R	@ B TF R	PRNR	*AI*, 4, pp. 201-2, 232, 236
CHANDRAVALLI Chitaldurg	N	I*	#* PM @ R	@ T R	NR	AI, 4, pp. 270-71, 287 90; *LAEA*, pp. 10, 30; *SS*, p. 30
CHILAMAKURU Cuḍḍapah	N* I*	I*	E*	E*	NIE	*IAR*, 1962-63, p. 65
CHINNAMARRUR Mahboobnagar	NC* #* H*	#* H*	–	–	CM	*IAR*, 1978-79, p. 64; DM, p. 28
GUḌIMALLAM Chittoor	–	–	E*	E*	OE	*IAR*, 1973-74, pp. 1-2
HALLUR Dharwar	LNUNC CI#	#* H	T*	–	NCM	*PHCTV*, pp. 12, 14, 31, 69, 91; *Madhu*, p. 26
HULIKALLU Anantapur	LNC* I #*	#*	–	–	NCM	*IAR*, 1978-79, pp. 62-63
KALYANDURG Anantapur	I* #*	#*	–	–	OM	*IAR*, 1962-63, p. 65; *DM*, p. 19
KAMBADURU Anantpur	N* I* #*	#*	E* R*	E* R*	MAE	*IAR*, 1962-63, p. 65; *DM*, p. 19

KUPGAL Chitradurg	N I*	I*	E*	E*	NIE	*AEK*, pp. 3, 17, 48
MASKI Raichur	UN C I	C I MA	E	@	NCIE	*AI*, 13, pp. 10, 12-13, 15, 16, 20
PALVOY Anantapur	N* I*	I*	–	–	NI	*IAR*, 1966-67, pp. 1-2; PEHC, p. 43
PIKLIHAL Raichur	LN UNC I	–	E* R*	E* R*	NCIE	*PE*, pp. xv, xvi; *BIC*, pp. 163,169
RAMAPURAM Kurnool	C	–	–	–	OC	*IAR*, 1982-63, p. 4
SANGANAKALLU Bellary	UN UNC UNI	–	–	–	NC	*BIC*, pp. 163, 168-70; *PEHC*, P. 21
SANNATI Gulbarga	–	–	B In R	B In R	RENR	*IAR*, 1966-67, p. 29, 1968-69, p. 47
SATANIKOTA Kurnool	ME*	# I NBP	@ TF	@ TF	PNR	*IAR*, 1977-78, pp. 3-8; *EAS*, pp. 33, 78-79, 82
TEKKALAKOTA Bellary	NC I	–	–	–	NCI	*EA*, pp. 106, *SAHT*, p. 3, 7, 9, *PPHC*, p. 520
VEERAPURAM Kurnool	LN UN C I	I PM@	@	@	NCIE	*VTSKV*, pp. 20-23, 26-29
VEMALAPADU Kurnool	–	–	E*	E*	OE	*IAR*, 1978-79, pp. 35-37
VGAON 'MADHAVPUR – Belgaum		–	@ R T In	@ R T	NR	*IAR*, 1971-78, p. 38, 17, 19, p. 24 (-72-73), *Madhu*, pp. 88, 92-95

Abbreviations
(Used In Charts)

AAHST — N.S. Ramaswamy, *Amaravati: The Art and History of the Stupa and the Temple*, Hyderabad, 1974.

AEK — G.G. Majumdar, S.N. Rajaguru, *Ashmound Excavations at Kupgal*, Poona, 1966.

AMYE — A.W. Khan, *A Monograph on Yeleswaram Excavations*, Hyderabad, 1963.

AVA — Amrendranath Nath, "Adam: An Index to Vidarbha Archaeology" in U.B. Nayaka & N.C. Ghosh (ed), *S.R. Rao 70th Felicilation Volume*, pp. 69-70.

BIC	*Birth of Indian Civilization* by B. & R. Allchin
BSAJ	J.A.S. Burgess, *The Buddhist Stupas at Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta*, Varanasi, 1970.
CC	S.B. Deo & Z.A. Ansari, *Chalcolithic Chandoli.*
CN	H.D. Sankalia *et al., Chalcolithic Navadatoli*, 1971.
CTS	I.K. Sarma, *Coinage of the Satavahanas*, New Delhi, 1980.
DM	K.P. Rao, *Deccan Megaliths*, Hyderabad, 1988.
EAK	M.G. Dikshit, *Excavations at Kaudinyapura*, 1968.
EAS	*Excavations at Satanikota*
EB	S.B. Deo & *R.S. Gupte, Excavations at Bhokardan*, Nagpur, 1974.
EBP	H.D. Sankalia & M.G. Dikshit, *Excavations at Brahmapuri (Kolhapur), 1945-46*, Poona, 1952.
EBRT	V. Dehejia, *Early Buddhist Rock Temples*, London, 1972.
EK	M.G. Dikshit, *Excavations at Kaundinyapur, 1968.*
EMN	H.D. Sankalia, *Excavations at Maheshwar and Mavadatoli.*
ENJ	*H.D. Sankalia & S.B. Deo, Excavations at Nasik and Jorwe*, Poona, 1955
ETK	S.B. Deo, *Excavations at Takalghat and Khapa*, Nagpur, 1970.
HPR	H.P. Ray, *Monastary and Guild, Commerce under the Satavahanas*, OUP, 1984.
HPN	H.D. Sankalia *et. al. From History to Prehistory at Nevasa (1954-56)*, Poona, 1960
LAEA	Amita Ray, *Life and Art in Early Andhradesa*, Delhi, 1983.
Madhu	M.S. Nagaraja Rao (ed.), *Madhu, Recent Researches in Archaeology and Art History*, Delhi, 1981.
NK	R. Subrahmanyam, *Nagarjunakonda.* Vol. I, 1954-60, New Delhi, 1965.
PAEX	S.B. Deo & M.K. Dhavalikar, *Paunar Excavations*, 1967.
PAUE	S.B. Deo & J.P. Joshi, *Pauni Excavations 1969-70*, Nagpur, 1972.
PE	F.R. Allchin, *Picklihal Excavations*, Hyderabad, 1960.
PEHC	V.V. Krishnasastry, *Proto and Early Historic Cultures of Andhra Pradesh*, Hyderabad, 1983.
PHCTV	M.S. Nagaraja Rao, *Proto Historic Cultures of the Tungabhadra Valley* (A Report on Hallur Excavations), Dharwar, 1971.
PPHIP	*Pre History and Proto History of India and Pakistan* by H.D. Sankalia
Pur.	*Puratattva*
SEL	D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian Civilization*, Calcutta, 1964.
SS	P. Sitapati, (ed), *Satavahana Seminar*, Hyderabad, 1981.
RCIP	B. & R. Allchin, *Rise of Civilization in India and Pakistan*, New Delhi, 1983.

REMBH	*Report of the Excavation of Two Megalithic Burials at Hashmatpet* by S.B. Deo
RET	B.N. Chapekar, *Report on the Excavations at Ter*, 1969.
SAHT	*The Stone Age Hill Dwellers of Tekkalakota* by M.S. Nagaraja & K. C. Malhotra
UE	*Utnur Excavations by F.R. Allchin*
VEKV	*Vaddamanu Excavations and Explorations in the Krishna Valley* by BACRI
VTSKV	*Veerapuram - A Type Site for Cultural Study in the Krishna Valley* by Kasturi Bai, T.V. G. Sastri & J. Vara Prasada Rao

11

Commerce of Jammu under the Kushāṇas–Possibility of Sātavāhana Context Analysed

Y.B. SINGH

Archaeolgical explorations of Jammu region and excavations at its two places–Manda and Ambaran – suggest that entrepot – like Kushāṇa settlements along the river Chenāb were in plenty. Besides this we have foundations of brick structures of that phase from Kiramchī and Babor where later on Brahmaṇical temples of *the nāgara* style were constructed, in early mediveral days. Such brick remains indicate the possibility of the construction of Buddhist and Brāhamaṇical temples in Kushāṇa period.[1] The proposition appears correct when we take into consideration the fact that if rulers like Kanishka I provided patronage to Buddhism, the Brāhmaṇical religious systems, too, succeeded in obtaining the munificence of Wema Kadphises and Vāsudeva I.[2] In this context it should also be noted that now scholars believe that even Vāsudeva I ruled over the areas of Jammu and Kashmir.[3] Be that as it may, at least it is certain that along the Chenāb, around Akhnūr, Kushāṇa entrepots were there and at important halting places, like Kiramchī and Babor, there were temple type brick structures.[4] Another factor, which needs our attention, is that from the aforementioned Kushāṇa entrepots, so far, pottery alone has been reported and only one such site has yielded a coin.[5] Besides this we also know that such entrepots are located near the river Chenāb beyond its flood-marks. Their location also suggests that, in the absence of the requisite area for further extensions, they were planned only as entrepots. Similarly non-reporting of inscriptions, which have been found more often than not at other important Kushāṇa places, indicates that the sites of the Jammu region do not suggest any political context.[6] Thus herein we propose to have an analytical understanding of the Kushāṇa sites of Jammu in view of their trade importance along with the factors which were responsible for the sudden boost to trade.

At this point when we try to know the position of Akhnūr, around which are more

Kushāṇa sites, then we learn that its Harappan phase is well known and there is no need to detail it in the present context.[7] The excavations which were carried out by the Archaeological Survey of India at the said place, however, show its continuation in the Kushāṇa period also.[8] Rather after the Harappans it shows association mainly with the Kushāṇa phase. It remained a centre of trade since then and, it is still famous for that. Its fort, whose present structure is of early modern period, has a dockyard which was constructed keeping in view the requirement of commercial boats.[9] All this is not without reason. The river Chenāb becomes fit for the movement of big commercial boats, for the first time, at this place, after its descent from the hills. The very name Akhnūr is the corrupt form of the word *akshayanīra* (the place where water is available throughout the year) which was opted by the people keeping in view the fact that other rivulets of the area go dry in summer. The wooden logs, bags containing herbs, etc., are even nowadays dropped at the higher ridges and are collected by the agents of the traders at the said place, for the onward transport. And, centrainly it was this purpose for which the people used the place in early days also. The Kushāṇa settlements in and around Akhnūr along the course of Chenāb, as stated above, were brought into existence by the traders to serve the purpose of entrepots alone. This suggests that the activities of Kushāṇa days in Jammu are to be understood only in relation to their trade context. Even the Valley of Kashmir had witnessed extensive trade during the phase which is connected with the Kidāra Kushāṇas and the Gupta rule. For, the reported sculptures, etc. from Ushkar, the town connected with the Kushāṇas, are of late Gandhāran period, which corresponds to fourth-fifth centuries AD.[10]

The presence of many Kushāṇa entrepots in a particular area of Jammu, however, raises certain questions which, if answered, may prove very important from the view-point of the contact between Jammu and other parts of the country as well as with Greece and Rome. The first question concerns the commodity for which so many entrepots were required. In reply to this we have reference to only costus which was exported to Rome through the port of Barygaza (Broach), as per the account contained in the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*.[11] Its use by the Hebrews and the Greeks, too, is known to us, but boost to its export was mainly during the days of the Roman ascendancy.[12] Besides this there are references to the export of the wool of shawl goat of Kashmir to Egypt through the ports of North-Western India.[13] But it is not clear whether the export was carried from the port of Barygaza or from those situated in Sindh, which became popular as early as time of Darius I, when his Captain Scylax of Carriadna navigated the Indus river system from the sail of commercial boats.[14] But at this point one has to take into consideration two basic issues. In the first place the connection of the Valley of Kashmir with the Silk routes is to be assessed properly. Because if other goods were carried to the West through the Silk routes then why costus and shawl-wool alone were sent via the sea-route which involved a long journey

through the rivers also. Secondly we have to take into account the quantity of costus, which was exported, to justify many a Kushāṇa entrepots of the Jammu region. In this regard it is now almost certain that the Central Asian trade route was, for the first time, described in detail by Marinus of Tyre, who lived some two generations later than the author or authors of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.*[15] In the light of this information, thus, there is no alternative except to believe that the early trade of wool, costus, etc., was carried through the sea route alone via river Chenāb (the Chandrabhāgā of Vedic days). As stated above, the export of at least costus was going on since very early days and the Indus river system was used for the purpose of commerce from the days of Darius I. The Hebrew priests were aware of costus and the list of items, which were sent by Seleucus, the famous general of Alexander to one of his friends makes special reference to one pound of costus.[16] Later it became very popular in Rome. According to Pliny, it was given too much importance by the people of his country and, as a result of this, it used to cost five Denarii per pound.[17] In view of its great popularity and demand one cannot presume that before the popularity of Central Asian trade routes the export of costus was not in a flourishing condition. Moreover, as mentioned above, sea route connecting India, at least with Western Asia, was already there because of the efforts of the Persians in sixth century BC. It was so well-known and safe that Alexander for the Katabasis of his demoralised army had decided to opt only this one.[18] Further since the opinion that the sea-routes became popular only when Hippalus came to know about the pattern of monsoon winds in the first century AD has been proved wrong,[19] no one can say that the sea routes were not common and safe in pre-Hippalus days. The much talked credit which was given to Hippalus is now treated as "Roman ethnocentric nonsense".[20] Now it is believed that, "The people who lived on the shores of northern Indian Ocean knew about monsoon all along; for the same reasons Romans knew about winter and summer. For this part of the Indian Ocean, the monsoonal pattern was more complex than a simple east-west alternation."[21] The transport of hill products through rivers to important ports was popular even in later days. The account of a Muslim author gives a vivid description about the procedure through which Kashmiri goods were sailed to Mansura. It says that the agents of the traders used to prepare bales of *qast-hundi* (a kind of herb, perhaps costus). Each such bale weighed seven or eight *manas.*[22] Thereafter several such bales were tied with each other and expert sailors used to float them down by sitting on them.[23] The journey from the foot of hills to Mansura was completed by such people in about forty days.[24]

On the basis of such details it is easy to infer that the Kushāṇa settlements of the Jammu region were brought into existence mainly due to the requirements of marine trade. Their main function was to collect small bales of costus and wood, etc., which were dropped at the higher ridges, from Chenāb. Afterwards their transport to ports,

for the purpose of export, through river and land routes was arranged. And, Akhnūr and its adjoining places were in use for the said purpose even during the time of Darius I in the construction of whose palaces Indian wood *Yakā* (oak) was used.[25] This shows the easy and safe sea journey which was known to the traders of Jammu region of his days. Our presumption in this regard is supported from the fact that Scylax of Carrianda who was deputed by Darius I to navigate the Indus river system is said to have started his journey from a town of Caspapyra (generally identified with Kashmir).[26] And in view of the location of Akhnūr it would not be far-fetched to identify the said Kashmir town with the present-day Akhnūr. In this context it should also be noted that the present-day people of Akhnūr are mainly Kashmiris.

The data cited above in general and those which suggest that early marine trade between India and Western Asia was through the Indus river system and ports of Sindh pose another problem. The problem is that the *Periplus of Erythraean Sea* nowhere talks about the ports of Sindh in detail, whereas it talks of Barygāza, even in connection with the trade which was carried by the Greeks.[27] It appears surprising as we know that it was in the time-frame of the aforementioned text that the Indo-Bactrian Greeks were dominating the political horizon of North-Western India. Why then was it that the port of Barygaza was used even by the Greeks, who were aware of North-Western part of our country since the days of Darius I and there were Greek settlements in that area at least from the days of Alexander's invasion? Later, Śākala (Siālkot of Pakistan) became the capital of Menander of the Indo-Bactrian Greek line and was named as Euthydemia.[28] But even goods from Bactria, the stronghold of Bactrian Greeks, were carried to Barygaza for further sail.[29] The underlining of this phenomenon is thus essential to understand the causes due to which Barygaza became very important among the traders of Greece, Bactria, Jammu and other parts of Northern and North-Westen India in the early centuries of the Christian era. For this purpose we have to take into consideration the political condition of Sindh and North-Western India as in absence of peace, trade cannot prosper. And, in this regard it is a well-known fact that the area was disturbed due to the invasion of Alexander. The political stability which was created by the Mauryas was again disturbed by the Greeks when that part of India was conquered by Antiochus III in 206 BC.[30] Since then the area failed to witness the peace because of the internecine wars of the Indo-Greeks and the invasion of other foreigners. The region achieved proper political set up only in Kushāṇa days when for the development of trade the rulers tried to maintain peace. But by that time trade with Rome through the western coastal regions had become very popular. The obvious reason was the peace, law and order provided by the Sātavāhanas in an attempt to promote the internal and external trade.[31] And it is a well-known fact that once a place is established as a trade centre with the requisite facilities,

the traders do not dare to leave it due to the avenues and existing contacts for smooth commercial transactions. Moreover, when we go though the details of the goods which were exported to Rome, etc., then we find mainly the names of spices and other products of Sourth India.[32] As a result of this it was not possible for the sailors to use the ports of Sindh only to collect costus and woollen goods of Jammu and Kashmir.

In view of these facts it is apparent that the commerce of Jammu region under the Kushāṇas flourished mainly because of the facilities which were created by the Sātavāhanas for the marine trade. The commercial commodities of Kashmir, which used to pass through Akhnūr, too, were sent through the port of Barygaza. The impact of such contacts was realised in other spheres of life also. It were such contacts that made the people of Kashmir aware of the areas of the Deccan. Such contacts continued in later times also. There are references to the scholars of early medieval Kashmir who embellished the courts of the rulers of the Deccan.[33] The stylistic similarity systamise between the temples of Gop and Kashmir is well known.[34] This apart there are references even to the diplomatic relations which the rulers of the Deccan tried to have with Kashmir as late as the closing years of the twelfth century AD.[35] Even certain things related to the army of the Chālukyas were planned keeping in view the models developed in Kashmir.[36] To conclude, the marine trade facilities created by the Sātavāhanas paved the way for the broad-based interaction between Jammu-Kashmir and the Deccan.

Notes and References

1. Y.B. Singh, "Early Medieval Sculptures of Jammu Region", *PIHC*, 54th Session, 1993 (Presidential Address for Section V), pp. 775-96.
2. H.C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, University of Calcutta, 6th edition, 1953, pp. 475, 464, 478.
3. B.N. Mukherjee, *The Rise and Fall of the Kushāṇa Empire*, Firma K.L.M. Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988, p. 160.
4. Y.B. Singh, *op.cit.*
5. *IAR, 1981-82,*. p. 18.
6. Y.B. Singh, "Silk Route and the Economy of Jammu and Kashmir under the Kushāṇas" in the *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Kushāṇas and Silk Roads*, Kabul, Nov. 20–22, 1990, pp. 63-77.
7. Madhu Bala, "Akhnoor–A Revealing Discovery", *Shiraza*, J&K Cultural Academy, Srinagar, Vol. I, No. 2, July-Dec., 1988.
8. *Ibid.*
9. Poonam Chowdhary, *Fort of Akhnur*, M.Phil. dissertation, History Department, Jammu University, 1990.

10. R.C. Kak, *Handbook of the Archaeological and Numismatic Sections of the S.P.S. Museum*, Srinagar, Thacker, Spink & Company, Calcutta & Simla, 1923, pp. 131-32.
11. *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, Travel and Trade in the Indian Ocean by a merchant of the First Century AD, translated from the Greek and annotated by Wilfred H. Schoff, Longmans Green and Co., London, 1912, p. 168.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
13. E.H. Warmington, *The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India*, Vikas Publishing House, Pvt. Ltd., 2nd revised and enlarged edition, Delhi, p. 160; George Olms, *Trade-Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire*, Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim, 1961, unchanged reprint of 1924 edition, p. 59.
14. *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, p. 189; John A. Boyle (ed.), *Persia: History and Heritage*, Henry Malland for the British Institute of Persian Studies, London, 1978, p. 21.
15. *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, p. 269.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
17. *Ibid.*
18. R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalkar (ed.), *AIU*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1990, pp. 50-51.
19. Philip D. Curtin, *Cross-Cultural Trade in World History*, Studies in Comparative World History, Cambridge University Press, Sydney, 1984, p. 97.
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*
22. H.C. Verma, *Medieval Routes to India: Baghdad to Delhi*, Naya Prokash, Calcutta, 1978, p. 233.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. John A. Boyle, *op.cit.*, p. 21. "The Yakā timber was brought from Gandhāra and from Carmania". In this context it should be noted that according to the Jātakas, Kashmir was included in the Gandhāra region in early days.
26. *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, p. 189.
27. G. Yazdani (ed.) *EHDY*, Oxford University Press, London, 1960, pp. 138-39; R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalkar (eds.), *op.cit.*, p. 603.
28. H.C. Raychaudhuri, *op.cit.*, p. 383.
29. R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalkar (eds.), *op.cit.*, p. 603; Y.B. Singh, "Roots of the Gaṇikā-Culture in Early India", *ABORI, XXIV*, 1993, pp. 181-90; *the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, p. 287, clearly mentions Yavana (Greek) girls brought from Greece for sale in India through Barygaza.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

31. *EHDY*, pp. 138-139.
32. *AIV*, *op.cit.*, p. 602.
33. *EHDY*, pp. 451-52.
34. R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalkar (eds.), *The Struggle for Empire*, Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1966, p. 584.
35. V.V. Mirashi, *Inscriptions of the Śilāhāras, CII, VI*, Archiological Survey of India, New Delhi, 1977, p. lxxv: ''We learn from the *Śrīkaṇṭhacharita* of Maṅkha that Tejakaṇṭha, an ambassador of Aparāditya, the lord of Kōṅkaṇa, visited the Court of Jayasiṁha, king of Kashmir (*circa* A.D. 1128-50)'' For Kashmiri versions of Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛihatkathā, vide* Ajay Mitra Shastri, *India as sean in the Kuttanī-mata of Dāmodragupta*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1975, pp. 27-28. See also Brahmanand Deshpande's paper on the subject included in the volume. —*Infra*, pp. 205-15. —Ed.
36. *EHDY*, p. 435.

12

Early Buddhist Monachism and its Socio-Economic Implications

HIMANSHU PRABHA RAY

This paper essentially deals with the expansion of Buddhism in the Deccan in the Early Historical period and the interactive relationship between the Saṅgha, the laity and the ruling elite viz. the Sātavāhanas. One of the unique features of early Buddhism was that it was conceived as a missionary religion and monks and nuns were exhorted to travel to different regions of the country to spread the message of the Buddha. How then did monks travel and what mode did they use? References in literature indicate that generally monks joined a caravan or group of merchants. During the course of the journey, the caravan leader provided the monk security and food in return for religious discourse and spiritual knowledge. The stress on the missionary activity of early Buddhism is evident from the fact that though the Vinaya rules forbade a monk to travel during the rainy season, an exception was made for the monk who was with a caravan or travelling by ship. An episode in the *Milindapañha* highlights one of the possible alternatives available to a monk while moving from place to place. The venerable Nāgasena once wanted to travel to Pāṭalīputra and was apprehensive about how and where he would obtain alms and food on the way. Just then he met a caravan on its way to Pāṭalīputra and the merchant leader requested him to join the caravan and to preach the Dhamma to him on the way. One of the developments in early Buddhism that encouraged travel was the practice of making portable objects of worship which could easily be carried by travellers. There are references to Buddhist formulae inscribed on bowls and the concept of the bowl as an article of worship. Also relevant in this regard is the testimony of I-tsing: 'The priests and the laymen in India make images with earth or impress the Buddha's image on silk or paper and worship it with offerings wherever they go. Sometimes they build *stūpas* of the Buddha by making a pile and surrounding it with bricks

.... Anyone may thus employ himself in making the objects for worship' (Takakusu, 1896:150).

In the Mauryan period, the nucleus of Buddhist monastic sites was the Gaṅgā-Yamunā valley with a somewhat distant scatter at Sāñchī and Amarāvatī. At this time it was the largest cities that were capable of supporting religious centres, though this underwent a change in the post-Mauryan period. Several middle-rung urban centres developed and there is evidence to suggest that towns such as Atrañjikherā appeared capable of supporting religious establishments (Erdosy, 1988:77). This five-fold hierarchy of settlement continued in the Gaṅgā-Yamunā *doāb* in the period from 100 BC to 300 AD and the impression given in all respects is of a period of peak prosperity which is the culmination of the centuries of development, (*ibid.*, 78). There was not only a marked hierarchy of settlements at this time, but a horizontal expansion into peninsular India as well, together with the development of Buddhist monastic establishments along the new trade routes into the Deccan.

The major highway under the Mauryas was the *Uttarāpatha*, which linked the urban centres of the Gaṅgā valley with Pāṭaliputra, while the southern route or *Daksiṇāpatha* extended as far as the Deccan. It was along these routes that Buddhism travelled from its nucleus in the Gaṅgā valley (Ray, 1994: chap. 2). The beginnings of Buddhism in Gujarat go back to the regin of Aśoka and the early Buddhist affiliation of the area around Girnār is beyond doubt (Mitra, 1971:141). But perhaps one region which underwent total transformation in the post-Mauryan period was the Deccan. Nearly 800 Buddhist rock-cut caves were excavated in the western Deccan at strategic points – at the heads of passes and in the vicinity of ports. Perhaps the earliest Buddhist centres in the Deccan were located on the Andhra coast, with the Kṛishṇā delta forming the nucleus. The sites of Amarāvatī and Dharaṇikoṭa located on opposite banks of the river Kṛishṇā date from the Mauryan period (Sarma, 1987: 3). On the Koṅkaṇa coast Buddhist caves at Ṭhānāḷe and Koṇḍivaṭe date to around 100 BC (Dehejia, 1972:152-53). By the beginning of the Christian era, a series of *chaityas* and *vihāras* had developed in the vicinity of the major ports along the coast. Thus the caves at Sana and Talaja on the Saurāshṭra coast date to 100 AD (*ibid.*, 184). There are another 130 Buddhist caves around the present city of Mumbai at Kānherī, Marol, Magathana and Maṇḍapeśwar – the largest complex of 109 caves being at Kānherī, though some of these date to the ninth-tenth centuries AD (Fergusson and Burgess, 1880:348). The *Periplus* lists a series of ports along the south Koṅkaṇa coast and Buddhist monasteries have been found overlooking most of these. Two small caves lie at Kol near Bānkoṭ (Burgress, 1885:74); another twenty-six are located at Kuḍā at the head of the Rājāpur creek and yet another twenty-eight are at Mahāḍ to the south-east (Burgess and Indraji, 1976 (reprint), 3).

Further inland, the largest cluster of caves was at Junnar at the head of the Nāṇeghāṭ pass where 184 caves were located in the hills encircling the town within a radius of 8 km. It was also here that for the first time there is epigraphic reference to the donation of land to monastic establishments, dated to the first century AD (*ibid.*, 44-47). In contrast the inscriptions at Kānherī in the vicinity of the ports of Kalyāṇa and Sopārā record gifts in the form of perpetual endowments of money ranging from 200 to 1600 *kahāpaṇas* and land-grants are comparatively few (Burgess, 1883: nos. 17, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28). A third group of caves was located at Nāsik at the head of the Thālghāṭ. Royal inscriptions by the Sātavāhanas and the Kshatrapas at the site record donations of land and villages to the monastic establishments (Senart, 1905-6: nos. 5, 6; also Ray, 1986:ch. 4). Another site where royal donations figure prominently is that of Kārle (Burgess & Indraji, 1976 : nos. 2, 10, 13, 14).

In the eastern Deccan an early pocket of Buddhist influence under the Mauryas was in the lower Kṛishṇā valley at Amarāvatī, and it was from here that there was a proliferation of settlements in the post-Mauryan period. The greatest concentration of Buddhist monastic sites continued in the Kṛishṇā delta, a fertile rice growing area, but an equal number of settlements were distributed along the eastern sea-board from Kaliṅgapaṭnam or Śālihuṇḍam in the north to Rāmatīrtham on the Pennār in the south (Sarkar, 1987:631-42). Monastic sites were also located along arterial routes such as the one passing through Jagayyāpeṭa, Gajulabanda, Koṇḍāpur and Ter, while a major site *en route* from the lower Kṛishṇā valley to Ter was Sannati in the Gulbargā district (*ibid.*). This survey of early Buddhist monastic sites shows their location along trade routes and the extraordinary increase in their number in the period between 200 BC and 300 AD. The middle Gaṅgā valley was the original nucleus for the emergence of Buddhism in the first millennium BC, but in this region as well monastic establishments underwent expansion and embellishment in the post-Mauryan period. Thus the *stūpa* at Piprahwā was enlarged during the Kushāṇa period (Śrivāstava, 1986 : 88), while that at Vaiśāli was encased in brick in the early centuries AD (Mitra, 1971 : 74-75). Two areas which have so far provided little structural evidence of early Buddhism are Bengal and South India, i.e. Tamilnāḍu and Kerala, but this may be linked to the problems of generating an agricultural surplus capable of supporting a resident population of monks.

D.D. Kosambi (1955) was perhaps the first scholar who had suggested a close relationship between the location of monastic sites and trade routes in the Deccan. He had, however, attributed this interaction to direct and active involvement of Buddhist monks and nuns in trade. He had argued that the rock-cut monasteries of the Deccan may have been used as storehouses by merchants and that the Buddhist clergy would also have loaned money to merchants at an interest. Besides 'the monasteries were

untaxed and their possessions not in danger of arbitarary confiscation by kings or officials as might be a lay merchant's hoard. A secondary economic function, the charitable use of monastic grain for the relief of famine, scarcity or individual distress among laymen, gained them special reverence from the savage tribes and the earliest villagers' (1955 : 60-1).

Subsequently the whole question was re-examined by Heitzman who argued that in the vast majority of cases, monasteries were situated at a distance away from the urban centres. At Taxila, almost all Buddhist structures were located on hills or along rivers and were outside the walled towns. At Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Buddhist locations are scattered throughout the valley, but are absent from the Ikshvāku citadel and temple complex along the river. 'The location of the Buddhist monastic sites at a distance from the scenes of political and economic activity made their direct participation in such activity inefficient. There is further no artifactual or structural evidence pointing to military, storage or industrial functions within monasteries' (1984 : 132).

My own research has convinced me that there were no simple correlations and the picture was far more complex. There were several reasons for the close interaction between trading and other occupational groups and the monastic establishments in the Early Historical period. One of course was the importance given to occupation in Buddhism rather than the *varṇa* status. This was crucial in the case of the Deccan where the earlier settlements prior to Mauryan contact were those of the Megalithic communities in the eastern Deccan and a few exchange centres in the western part (Ray, 1989). The expansion of trading networks resulted in increased prosperity, and in this fluid social situation, Buddhist monastic establishments not only acted as pioneers, but also provided status and a distinct identity to its *upāsakas*. The second was the fact that at this time, Buddhism was the only institutionalised religion. The development of the monastic institution where monks lived together was a unique feature of Buddhism. The Brāhmaṇical and Jaina ascetics were basically wanderers and stayed together only for a limited period during the rainy season. Another early tradition in Buddhism was the evolution of the worship of the *stūpa*. One must remember that the Brāhmaṇical temple was still in an embryonic stage in the early centuries of the Christian era, whereas the Buddhist monasteries were elaborate structures and had access to landed property. One of the major rituals observed in these monastic establishments was the *uposatha* ceremony. This ceremony was celebrated every fortnight on the occasion of the full moon and the new moon and both the monks and the lay devotees joined together in it. While the monks recited the Buddhist canon, the lay devotees reaffirmed their vows. It was also on these occasions that gifts and donations were made. On the basis of inscriptional evidence we know that money and land were the two major items of *dāna* at the beginning of the Christian era.

At the economic level, not only did Buddhism encourage the investment of wealth in trading ventures, but it also fostered a cohesiveness among trading groups. There is abundant archaeological evidence for the use of Buddhist symbols and formulae on pottery, seals and sealings found extensively in the Early Historical period not only in the Deccan, but also at a large number of sites elsewhere in the Indian subcontinent.

Thus we see that the expansion of Buddhism into peninsular India brought about a significant change at several levels. The most obvious was in the nature of worship. It was the *stūpa* that was now a cult object and Megalithic monuments were no longer erected. The evidence from Amarāvatī indicates that some of the earlier locations of urn burials were now used for the erection of *stūpas*. Status markers in society had also changed, and wealth and status were now measured in terms of donations and gifts to monastic establishments. This is particularly noticeable in relation to the ruling elite.

The early inscriptions of the Sātavāhanas, for example, mention Vedic sacrifices being performed and large donations made to Buddhist monastic establishments. The Nāṇeghāṭ inscription of the Sātavāhana queen Nāyanikā refers to the performance of *yajñas* and donations to the brāhmaṇas. Inscriptions of Nahapāna's son-in-law Ushavadāta have been found at Nāsik and Kārle and a record of his minister occurs at Junnar. The Kshaharātas donated generously to both brāhmaṇas and the Buddhists. Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi ousted the Kshaharātas and re-established Sātavāhana rule in the Deccan. The Nāsik inscription of his mother Balaśrī describes Gautamīputra as the restorer of the glory of the Sātavāhanas and the king is described as a unique brāhmaṇa who crushed the pride of the kshatriyas.

The question then is: Why do the Sātavāhanas refer to themselves as brāhmaṇas? The Purāṇas refer to them as Andhrajāti, but they themselves do not call themselves Andhras (Shastri, 1988: ch. 3). We have argued elsewhere (Ray, 1986: chap. 5) that they may have been one of the tribal groups in the Deccan who rose to power as a result of the social and economic changes. They may have been a priestly clan within the Andhra *jāti* who then assumed brāhmaṇa ancestry on acquiring political power. The inscriptional evidence also indicates that they continued to maintain marital alliances with other groups such as the Mahāraṭhis and the Mahābhojas. These titles suggest chiefly origins and perhaps these alliances were in keeping with the clan affiliations of the Sātavāhanas. This is supported by the numismatic evidence from post-Mauryan levels in the Deccan which indicates that several local elite termed Mahāraṭhis mited coins and inscribed these with their names.

Thus we see that with the expansion of Buddhism in the peninsula changes occurred at several different levels. At the political level donations to the Saṅgha were seen as major factors in legitimisation of status of the ruling elite; also the channels of

communication between the Saṅgha and the lay devotees could be used for spreading the message of the ruler. At the ideological level, the worship of the *stūpa* gained prominence. At the social level wealth or prestige was measured in terms of the gifts to the monastic establishments. At the economic level the identity of a common religion fostered by Buddhism led to an expansion of commercial interest along the trading networks.

Notes and References

J. Burgess, 1883, *Report on the Elura Cave Temples and the Brahmanical and Jaina Caves in Western India, ASWI*, V, London.

J. Burgess, 1885, *List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency, ASWI*, XI, Bombay.

J. Burgess, & B. Indraji, 1976, *Inscriptions from the Cave Temples of Western India, ASWI*, IV, Vārāṇasī (reprint).

V. Dehejia, 1972, *Early Buddhist Rock Temples,* London.

G. Erdosy, 1988, *Urbanisation in Early Historic India,* Oxford.

J. Fergusson, & J. Burgess, 1880, *Cave Temples of India*, London.

J. Heitzman, 1984, ''Early Buddhism, Trade and Empire'', eds. K.A.R. Kennedy & G.L. Possehl, *Studies in the Archaeology and Palaevanth ropology of South Asia*, New Delhi pp. 121-38.

D.D. Kosambi, 1955, ''Dhenukākaṭa,'' *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, 30: pp. 50-71.

D. Mitra, 1971, *Buddhist Monuments,* Calcutta.

H.P. Ray, 1986, *Monastery and Guild : Commerce under the Sātavāhanas,* Oxford University Press.

H.P. Ray, 1989, ''Early Historical Settlement in the Deccan : An Ecological Perspective'', *Man and Environment,* XIV, 1, pp. 103-8.

H.P. Ray, 1994, *The Winds of Change : Buddhism and the Maritime Links of Early South Asia,* Oxford University Press.

H.B. Sarkar, 1987, ''Emergence of Urban Centres in Early Historical Andhradesa'', (eds.) B.M. Pande & B.D. Chattopadhyaya, *Archaeology and History,* Delhi, pp. 31-42.

I.K. Sarma, 1987, *Religion in Art and Historical Archaeology of South India : Contacts and Correlations,* University of Madras.

E. Senart, 1905-6, ''The Inscriptions in the Caves at Nāsik,'' *EI,* VIII: pp., 59-96.

Ajay Mitra, Shastri, 1998, *The Sātavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas: A Historical Framenwork, Nagpur.*

K.M. Srivastava, 1986, *Discovery of Kapilavastu,* New Delhi.

J. Takakusu, 1986, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion,* London.

13

Hāla and Nāgārjuna

S.V. SOHONI

I. Bāṇabhaṭṭa (middle of the 7th century AD) had praised Sātavāhana's Prākṛit anthology, in these terms:[1]

अविनाशिनमग्राम्यमकरोत्सातवाहन:।

विशुद्धजातिभि: कोशं रत्नैरिव सुभाषितै:।।

Many editors of Hāla's *Gāthāsaptāśatī*, including great scholars like Weber in the 19th century AD and another great scholar of Sańskṛit and Prākṛit as well as of ancient Indian history and culture like the late V.V. Mirashi, in the 20th century, held the view that Hāla's Prākṛit anthology was initially named by its compiler as *Gāhākosa*, and it was renamed by him, later on, as Gāhā-Sattasaī, i.e., an anthology of seven hundred *gāthās*, when additions made to it had brought about the total[2]. Mirashi has also concluded that the nulceus of the anthology, as long as it was styled *Gāhā-kośa*, had consisted of those *gāthās* which were found to be present in all the subsequent MSS of that anthology which were laboriously examined by Weber, an eminent German scholar, in his edition of that work, in 1881 AD.

II. It is submitted that this theory is untenable, for the following reasons:

(i) It would have carried conviction had it been the fact that the *gāthās* found common to all later manuscripts examined by Weber, were arranged like beads strung together, i.e., with their *inter se* sequence intact. That, however, is *not* the case.

(ii) Mirashi's theory ignores completely the position that in compiling his anthology, Hāla Sātavāhana had a major objective in presenting the total number of the *gāthās* selected by him as seven hundred. Hāla's plain intention was to compete

with another *Saptaśatī*, viz. the *Bhagavad-gītā*, which was an argument in favour of a philosophical outlook advising the development towards achieving the ideal of Moksha whereas that of Hāla's *Satta-saī* was promoting the development of the ideal of everybody's *material* well-being.

(iii) There is, virtually, complete unanimity in available relevant evidence on the point that Hāla Sātavāhana was a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, the great Buddhist monk of the Mahāyāna persuasion. That Hāla and Nāgārjuna were contemporaries was stated even by Bāṇabhaṭṭa in his *Harsha-charita* itself. Nāgārjuna was equally well-known as interested in medical science or in preparing biochemical remedies. He was, what we may now call, a rationalist devoted to the view that what is not rationally demonstrable cannot be complete truth. There is some evidence to suggest that Nāgārjuna had probably become influential, sometime between 150 and 200 AD.

An important source of evidence regarding Hāla and Nāgārjuna being contemporaries is *Suhṛi-lekha* or 'The Epistle sent by a Well-wisher'—the sender being Nāgārjuna, and the recipient being Hāla.

In these circumstances, it would not be incorrect to hold the view that Hāla and Nāgārjuna were contemporaries—at least, on a *prima facie* basis.[3]

III. Let us now ascertain whether there is some evidence about the period of Nāgārjuna, keeping aside all the evidence about Hāla's period, i.e., other than that relating to his being a contemporary of Nāgārjuna.

(i) Such evidence regarding Nāgārjuna does exist—and that too in a form which cannot be ignored. It is commonly agreed that Ārya-deva was a direct disciple of Nāgārjuna. As pointed out by K. Satchidananda Murty[4], "There is no reasonable doubt about Ārya-deva being the principal and direct disciple of Nāgārjuna." As further pointed out by Murty, "Since 'Maitreya' and Asaṅga, of about 350 AD, commented on Nāgārjuna's works, these must have acquired authority by then. Kumārajīva translated Nāgārjuna's *magnum opus* and another of his works into Chinese in 409 AD, and *Mahāprājnā-pāramitā-śāstra*, which may be Nāgārjuna's work, in 405 AD. His immediate disciples, both important scholars, Seng-jui, and Seng-chao, and Hai-yuan, a contemporary scholar who was in correspondence with him, stated that Nāgārjuna and Ārya-deva had flourished in the 9th century after the Buddha's *Nirvāṇa*. In view of the date they take as that of Buddha's *Nirvāṇa*, this works out to be the first half of the third century AD."

(ii) In his famous work, *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* (London 1913), F.E. Pargiter included the dynasty of Hāla Sātavāhana. Pargiter

does not appear to have taken into consideration the point that most imperial powers in India's history witnessed struggles for supremacy among scions of an imperial dynasty, leading to several competing families claiming the imperial attributes of the founder. However, it appears that the so-called 'forecasts' in the text had taken into account only those rulers who had succeeded in maintaining a hold over practically all the domains. That the Purāṇic list presented in the *Text* by Pargiter was quite reliable, was proved in a gathering of the Fellows of the Royal Numismatic Society, in London, in 1937. I was, then, a fledgling F.R.N.S., taken to that meeting by my numismatic *guru*, the late Dr. R.B. Whitehead. Philip Thoburn surprised everybody present there, when he produced for inspection, a coin of Āpīlaka, whose name features in the list in *Text*. There were several other instances discovered later on, proving the authenticity of the list in the *Text*. Moreover, Hāla whose name features in this list, was a *Trisamudrādhipati* as well, a detail known to Bāṇabhaṭṭa. If he had a short reign, that was because he had to acquire that position–and the years in that preliminary phase of struggle, could not be added to those of the phase of his imperial status.

(iii) It may be recalled that Hāla was supposed to have been assisted in the compilation of his anthology by *Pālittaya* (=Pāda-lipta). Pāda-lipta is credited with having composed a poem known as *Taraṅgalolā*, in which Hāla Sātavāhana was credited with having gone to a nether world. While ancient Indian geography knew that the Himālayan range was in the north, the Pātāla region was located in the south. Even Aśoka, the Maurya, referred to the south as *nicha* in his rock inscriptions. Thus, the nether land became associated with Ceylon. It was to Ceylon that Hāla was supposed to have gone along with his contemporary, Nāgārjuna. The poem *Taraṅgalolā* also contains many interesting tit-bits about Hāla's dynasty.

Pāda-lipta's poem states that Hāla Sātavāhana had gone along with Nāgārjuna to Pātālaloka. It should be realised that both had gone to Nāgadvīppa, the inhabitants of the Pātāla region being coventionally assumed to be Nāgas. We have sufficient evidence to prove that the Jaffna peninsula of the island of Ceylon, was called Nāgadvīpa.

In Ptolemy's *Geography*, there is reference to Nagadidoi, identical with Nāgadīva of the *Mahāvaṁśa*. The earlier Greek geographers had expressed their belief that the island of Ceylon was a region belonging to the opposite portion of the world (Pliny, *Mv*, VI, CXXII). Even Kālidāsa[5], a court bard of the first three imperial Guptas, has referred to Samudra-Gupta's fame having entered into the areas occupied by Bhujaṅgamas (=Nāgas). Samudra-Gupta had politi-

cal relationship with Ceylon resulting in his obtaining a tribute of jewels, for granting permission to build a Mahāvihāra at Bodhgayā. Accordingly, it could safely be concluded that the joint visit of Hāla and Nāgārjuna to Pātālaloka really meant their trip to Ceylon.[6]

iv. As pointed out by S.A. Joglekar in his famous Marāthī edition of *Gāthā-Saptaśatī* (Pune, 1956), Hāla included such *gāthās* in his anthology as were extremely critical of Vedic/Brāhmaṇical gods and goddesses (*vide* pp. 155ff,). This was fully consistent with Hāla's Lokāyatika-Chārvāka stand. In this connection, Sadāshiv Āṭhavaḷe's exposition in his work, *Chārvāka–Itihāsa āṇi Tattvajñana* (Pune, 1958), is very instructive.

v. To conclude: it would be a great injustice to Hāla Sātavāhana to assume that he had collected only 430 *gāthās* to start with, calling that collection *Gāthā-Kośa;* or that he had revised the title subsequently when the later additions had made up to a total of 700 *gāthās*. His main purpose was that of being a social reformer and a good benevolent ruler. Accordingly, he decided to preach the Lokāyata doctrine by compiling a competing *saptaśatī*.

Notes and References

1. *Harsha-Charita*, VI. I.
2. What Mirashi actually establishes basing on the solid extant evidence is that till the time of Abhinanda (9th century AD) the *Gāhāsattasaï* was known as *Kosa* or *Gāhākosa* and thereafter owing to the facts that *kośa* came to denote lexical texts and that the anthology contained seven hundred stanzas it came to be styled *Sattasaï* or *Gāhāsattasaï*. *Vide* his *Studies in Indology*, I, 2nd edn, Vidarbha Sanshodhan Mandal, Nagpur, 1968, pp. 82-87 —Ed.
3. Further evidence in this connection is cited in my article ''Hema-rasāyana'' in *JBRS*, LVII, pp. 39-48.
4. K. Satchidananda Murty, *Nāgārjuna*, National Book Trust, New Delhi pp. 12-16.
5. *Raghuvaṁśa*, Canto VI, verse 77, describing Raghu (=Samudra Gupta, real founder of the Gupta Empire).
6. The author proceeds with the assumption that Kālidāsa lived in the Gupta age—Ed.

14

Guṇāḍhya and his Bṛihatkathā

BRAHMANAND DESHPANDE

1. Guṇāḍhya

Guṇāḍhya, a prolific writer of the Sātavāhana age, is credited with the authorship of *Vaḍḍakahā* in Paiśāchī language. The urbanised form of this name. viz. Bṛihaṭkathā, is more popular. The author seems to have composed this work around 1st-2nd century AD.

Very little is known about the family and parentage of this great author. He is said to be the *dauhitra* of a Brāhmaṇa called Somaśarmān, who had two sons named Vatsa and Gulma and a daughter called Śrutārthā, who gave birth to a son called Guṇāḍhya from the Nāga prince called Kīrtisena.[1]

This account lacks credibility. Vatsagulma was the capital of one of the branches of Vākāṭakas and this points towards the fakeness of the above account. Nevertheless, this has inspired some scholars to propound the theory that Vatsagulma (modern Wāshim, district Akolā, Mahārāshṭra) was the birthplace of Guṇāḍhya.[2] But we have nothing on our hands to corroborate it.

But Guṇāḍhya had definitely some connections with the Sātavāhana rulers of Pratishṭhāna (modern Paiṭhan, Aurangābād district), as is elucidated in the following pages.[3]

2. *Vaḍḍakahā or Bṛihatkathā*

The original *Vaḍḍakahā* was a work in the Paiśāchī language. The urbanisation of the title *Vaḍḍakahā,* as stated above, is *Bṛihatkathā.* A very interesting and popular anecdote, which speaks of the cause behind the composition of *Vaḍḍakahā,* is as under.

a. Guṇāḍhya, after completing his education successfully, went to Pratishṭhāna to see the Sātavāhana ruler.

b. It so happened that the king was once playing water-games with his spouses and a delicate damsel amongst them became tired and requested the king not to hit her with water. She said in Sanskṛit *modakais-tāḍaya (mā udakaiḥ tāḍaya)*. The ignoramus king could not understand the *sandhi*, took the sentence to mean that the queen wants to be hit by *modakas* or sugar-balls (*laḍḍūs*) and immediately caused a basketful of *laḍḍūs* to be brought on the scene.

c. The ladies of the royal harem derided the king, who, burning with the insult, decided to learn Sanskṛit in six months.

d. Guṇāḍhya, when asked to teach the king the Sanskṛit language in six months, declined to do so and replied in great pride that if someone else does so he (Guṇāḍhya) will relinquish speaking Sanskṛit, Prākṛit and Apabhraṁśa languages.

e. Śarvavarman, the other *paṇḍita* of the court, pleased God Kārttikeya by his penances. Kārttikeya bestowed upon him a treatise on grammar, called *Kātantra Vyākaraṇa*, and with its application Śarvavarman became successful in teaching the emperor the Sanskṛit language in six months.

f. The defeated Guṇāḍhya repaired to the Vindhyan forests, learned the Paiśāchī language and compiled an anthology of folk stories running into a lakh *ślokas*. Of course, the work was named as *Vaḍḍakahā* or the Great Tale.

3. *In Praise of Vaḍḍakahā,*

This *Vaḍḍakahā*, composed around 1st or 2nd century AD, becomes the earliest anthology of folk-tales in the world. The scholars were enamoured by these enchanting stories and have praised this work without reservations.

Uddyotanasūrī[4], a Jaina poet, who completed his work *Kuvalayamālā* on Phālguna, Śu.14, Śaka 700 (779 AD) waxes eloquent about the greatness of the *Vaḍḍakahā* in the following words:

Sakala - Kal=āgama - ṇilayā

sikkhāviyā kaviyaṇassa muhayandā ।

Kamalāsano Guṇaḍḍho

Sarassaï jassa Vaḍḍakahā ।।

Here Guṇādhya is compared with Lord Brahmā and *Vaḍḍakahā* with goddess Sarasvatī. The poets learn their skills from this work only.

Bāṇabhaṭṭa, the court-poet of the great emperor, Harshavardhana, has also eulogised this great work in the following words.[5]:

Samud=dīpita-kandarpā

kṛita-Gaurī-prasādhanā ।

Hara-līl=eva lokasya

Vismayāya Bṛihatkathā ।।

Here *Bṛihatkathā* is compared with the make-up of Pārvatī and is said to be promoting the erotic instincts. Bāṇabhaṭṭa seems to suggest the original *Bṛihatkathā* was, probably, in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvatī. The expression *samud=dīpita-kandarpā* suggests that the tales collected by Guṇāḍhya were amorous folk-tales.

Dhanapāla, the author of *Tilakamañjarī* (around 960 AD) also praises *Vaḍḍakahā* as follows:[6]

Satyaṁ Bṛihatkath=āmbhodher

=bindum=ādāya Saṁskṛitāḥ ।

ten=etara=kathād=kanthā

pratibhānti tad=agrataḥ ।।

Hemchandra, the great Śvetāmbara Jaina grammarian, has composed a work called *Kāvy=ānusāsana.* He himself has authored a commentary (*svopajñaṭīkā*) on this work. In this commentary he observes that the *Bṛihatkathā*, the tale of Naravāhanadatta, is the best example of wondrous tale (*adbhūta-kathā),* composed in the *lambhakas*[7] *(Lambh=āṅkit=ādbhut=ārtha-Naravāhana-charitra-vad=Bṛihatkathā).*

4. *Bṛihatkathā–A Cycle of Love-Stories.*

As noted above, *the Bṛihatkathā* seems to have been a cycle of love and adventure stories blended together. The most popular love story in this land is that of Udayana, the king of Kauśambī and Vāsavadattā, the daughter of Chaṇḍapradyota, the ruler of Avanti. Kālidāsa, in his *Meghadūta*, has alluded to the immense popularily of this love-story.

This love-story might have inspired Guṇādhya to create a complete cycle of love stories of Naravāhanadatta, the son of Udayana. This prince was the proverbial wanderer, who used to go on sea-voyages, face many a danger and at the end of the voyage married a new maiden.

5. *Lambhaka*

The *Bṛihatkathā* was divided into several sections called *lambhaka*. This seems to be a Paiśāchī word. Most of the scholars, while writing on the *Bṛihatkathā*, have given its meaning as a *viśrānti-sthāna*. As we have seen earlier, the hero, Naravāhanadatta, marries a beautiful young girl at the end of his arduous journey. *Lambhaka*, in Mahārāshṭrī Prākṛit, means a lover. The *Gāthāsaptaśatī*, an anthology of Mahārāshṭrī Prākṛit poems compiled by Hālā Sātavāhana, alludes to a *deśī* word, *lemhaḍa* in the sense of a lover or beloved. Paiśāchī is akin to Mahārāshṭrī Prākṛit in many respects and Guṇāḍhya definitely flourished in the Sātavāhana period. This may explain the expression *Samud-dīpita-kandarpā of* the Bāṇabhaṭṭa. The common folk of the Vidarbha region even today use the word lanhaḍa for a henpecked husband.

6. *Later Versions of the Bṛihatkathā*

Unfortunately, the original *Bṛihatkathā* is lost to us for ever. What we have on our hands are the later Prākṛit and Sanskṛit versions of the original work, abridged, distorted and sometimes far away from the parent theme.

1. *Bṛihatkathāślokasaṅgraha.*[9]

Budhasvāmin (*c.* 5th century AD) has abridged the original voluminous work in 28 *sargas* and named it *Bṛihatkathāślokasaṅgraha*. The impact of the splendorous age of the Guptas is clearly discernible in this work.

The Bṛihatkathāślokasaṅgraha is the Nepālī version of the *Bṛihatkathā*. Its 28 *sargas* contain 4,539 *ślokas*. But the work is incomplete as it narrates the stories of only six marriages of Naravāhanadatta. Nevertheless, the author has narrated these stories in a very beautiful style.

2. *Vasudevahiṇḍi*[10]

About a century later, Saṅghādāsagaṇin, a Jain author, composed a work called *Vasudevahiṇḍi* which is a Prākṛit and prose version of *the Bṛihatkathā*. The word *hiṇḍi* means wandering and is still in use in the Marāthī language.

There are two versions of the *Vasudevahindi* also. The first composed by Saṅghadāsagaṇin is called *Prathamakhaṇḍa* which runs in 29 *lambakas*. Dharmadāsagaṇin, a century later appended to it 79 *lambakas* and this part is called *Madhyamakhaṇḍa*. Dharmadāsagaṇin claims that he has narrated the stories of 79 marriages and had completed the *Prathamakhaṇḍa* of Sanghadāsagaṇin, which in 29 *lambakas* narrates the account of the 29 marriages of Vasudeva. But these two parts of the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* do not go together.

The Vasudevahiṇḍi of Saṅghadāsagaṇin is divided into seven parts, *viz. Kathotapatti*,

Dhammilahiṇḍi, Peḍhiyā (Pīṭhikā), Mukha, Pratimukha, Śarīra and Upasaṁhāra. The last but one part contains, in 29 *lambakas,* the account of 29 marriages of Vasudeva. Even then the work is incomplete. The 19th and 20th *lambakas* are lost for ever. The 18th *lambaka* is called *Piyaṅgusundarī-lambaka* after which starts the *madhyama-khaṇḍa* of Dharmadasagaṇin.

Dhammilahiṇḍi, which starts after *Kathotpatti,* is clearly a later addition to the original text of *the Vasudevahiṇḍi.* It narrates the account of 32 marriages of a prince called Dhammila.

Vāsudeva of *the Vāsudevahiṇḍi* is the king of the Andhaka-Vṛishṇis and the father of Lord Kṛishṇa. The *Pratimukha* part records a conversation between Vasudeva and Pradyumna. The latter jeers at the old king, Vasudeva, saying, 'Look! Śāmba had married 100 maidens while you have to roam the earth for 100 years to get 100 damsels'. Vasudeva replies, 'Śāmba is the proverbial frog of the pond. For 100 years I have hazarded voyages full of dangers and pains and as a result of these painstaking voyages I could procure 100 maidens'. Then the old veteran sets out to narrate his adventures, which forms the *Śarīra* part of this work. The last part viz. *Upasaṁhāra* is lost for ever.

The Āvaśyakachūrṇi, a Jain work, refers to the *Vasudevahiṇḍi.* The date of the *Āvaśyakachūrṇi* is about the seventh century AD. So this becomes the *terminus ad quem* of the date of *the Vasudevahiṇḍi.*

3. *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī*

Kshemendra, the illustrious Sanskṛit polymath, was the court poet of the Kashmīrī king Anantadeva(1029-64 AD). He has narrated the stories of the *Bṛihatkathā* in 18 *lambakas* in a work called *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī.*

4. *Kathāsaritsāgara*

Somadeva, another Kashmīrī poet, has presented the last version of the *Bṛihatkathā* under the name *Kathāsaritsāgara* which runs into 18 *lambakas* and each *lambaka* is divided into several *taraṅgas.* Of course, the original *Bṛihatkathā,* though divided into *lambakas,* did not have any sub-chapters called *taraṅgas.* The name *Kathā-sarit-sāgara,* probably inspired Somadeva to name these sub-chapters as *taraṅgas.* Thus the work of Somdeva runs into 18 *lambakas,* 124 *taraṅgas* and 21,388 *slokas.*

Somadeva maintains that he had only abridged the original *Bṛihatkathā (Bṛihatkathāyāḥ sārasya saṅgrahaṁ rachayāmy, ahaṁy lambaka* 1, *taraṅga* 1, *śloka* 3). He did it for the entertainment of the queen Sūryamatī, the spouse of Anantadeva (1063-81 AD). Sūryamatī was the daughter of the ruler of Trigarta (Kallū-Kāṅgḍā region). Somadeva further says

that he avoided all the aberrations from the original theme. He also claims that he has attempted to simplify the original complex cycle of the love-stories (*nānā-kathā-jāla-smṛiti-saukarya-siddhaye).*

Somadeva's style is lucid and simple. But it has the extraordinary capacity of luring the reader into ecstasy. The beauty of his superb narration is comparable with that of the style of Kālidāsa.

Somadeva has done a unique service to the lovers of folk-tales by rendering the original work of Paiśāchī language into Sanskṛit. But his skill in presenting the gist of the stories has deprived us of the details and beauties of the original work.

7. *Bṛihatkathā–The Wonder of Wonders*

All the later versions of *Bṛihatkathā* help us to have a glimpse of the original work. It probably had the following sections :

1.	*Kathāpīṭha*	*Maṅgalācharaṇa.* The Śiva-Pārvatī dialogue. The curse on Pushpadanta and Mālyavān. Other allied stories. The story of Guṇādhya.
2.	*Kathāmukha*	The account of Udayana and his queens.
3.	*Sarīra*	The stories narrated by Naravāhanadatta.
4.	*Upasaṁhāra*	Epilogue.

The *Bṛihatkathā* was a vast ocean of folk-tales. The Arabian Nights (*Lailā va Alif Lailā*=The stories of One thousand and one nights *(Lailā*=night, *Alif*=one thousand), the voyages of Sindabād, the *Vetāla-pañchaviṁśati,* all owe their origin to this great work. Bocassio, Chaucer, Law Foncen and other story-tellers are also indebted to Guṇāḍhya. Its vast expanse unravels before us the mysteries of black magic, the palace intrigues and unfolds a vast canvas depicting myriad characters consisting of courtesans, drunkards, gamblers, beggars,hunters, farmers and others. Really, this work was a wonder of wonders.

3. *Guṇāḍhya in Ancient Epigraphs*

Like all the other men of letters of the Sanskṛit and Prākṛit languages, we know very little about the life of Guṇāḍhya. But the popularity of his work, *Bṛihatkathā,* has earned for this author, references in two epigraphs. They are as follows.

1. *The Gumma Reḍḍipur Copper-plates of Durvinīta*[11]

The Gumma Reḍḍipur (district Kolār Karṇaṭaka) copper-plates of the Gaṅga king, Durvinīta, extol him by saying that he proved his erudition by composing an abridged version of *Bṛihatkathā.*

2. *The Inscriptions of Yaśovarman II of Kambuja*[12]

Yaśovarman II of Kambuja (889-902 AD) was a scholar of great renown. His father, Indravarman, had appointed a teacher called Vāmaśiva to teach him the great works of Sanskṛit language. Three records of this scholar extol this ruler for authoring a commentary on the *Bṛihatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya, who is styled as *Prākṛita-priya*.

9. *The Birthplace of Guṇāḍhya.*

As has been noted above, the original *Vaḍḍakahā* of the Paiśāchī language is lost to us for ever. The only detailed and systematic version that we have on our hands is the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva. It gives us a faint hint of the birthplace of Guṇādhya. The sixth *taraṅga* of the first *lambaka* (Kathāpīṭha-lambaka) contains the following *śloka*:[13]

Pratishṭhān=esti nagaraṁ
Supratishṭhita-sañjñakam ।
tatrr=ābut=Somaśarm=ākhyaḥ
k=opi brāhmaṇa-Sattamaḥ ।।

We have seen earlier that this Soma-śarmān was the father of Śrutārthā, who bore Guṇāḍhya from Kīrtisena, the Nāga prince. Hence it follows that Guṇāḍhya was born in a town called Supratishṭhita, which was in Pratishṭhāna. Pat comes the remark that the expression *Pratishṭhān=esti nagaraṁ Supratishṭita-sañjñakaṁ* is rather strange and defies the rules of grammar. What Somadeva hints at is not very clear. Was the town of Supratishṭhita, part of (a suburb of) the city of Pratishṭhāna? Or was this town included in the territorial division of Pratishṭhāna? (Pratishṭhāna Deśa, Bhukti, Vishaya or Āhāra). The import of Somadeva is not clear. Was Guṇāḍhya born at Pratishṭhāna? Somadeva further informs us that after the death of his mother Guṇāḍhya went to Dakshiṇāpatha to prosecute his studies. After the completion of his studies, he returned to his own land *(sva-deśa āgato)* to exhibit his talents, entered the town called Supratishṭhita; (*Praviśaṁś=cha chirāt tatra nagare Supratishṭhite*). He saw many a good scene in this town and then he visited the splendorous palace (*Mahendra-Sadan=opamaṁ*) of the king Sātavāhana (*rājānaṁ Sātavāhanaṁ*).

Then follows the story of the king Sātavāhana playing water-sports with his spouses in a garden called *Devikṛita* on the banks of the river Godāvarī.

All these statements can be culled together as follows:

1. Somaśarman was a resident of Supratishṭhita-nagara in Pratishṭhāna.
2. His daughter gave birth to a son called Guṇāḍhya from the Nāga prince, Kīrtisena.

3. Guṇāḍhya went to Dakshiṇāpatha for his studies.
4. He returned to Supratishṭhita-nagara and saw the palace of the Sātavāhana king.
5. Now if we identify Supratisṭhita-nagara with Pratishṭhāna, then it would look rather strange that Guṇādhya should go to Dakshiṇāpatha for his studies because Pratishṭhāna is very much in Dakshiṇāpatha itself.
6. *Devikṛita* garden was on the banks of the river Godāvarī, so Supratishṭhita-nagara should be located on the banks of the Godāvarī.

All this seems to be rather confusing. Somadeva wrote his work between 1063 AD and 1081. He was a resident of Kashmīr and obviously ignorant about the geography of distant Dakshiṇāpatha. Again, we are not sure, whether he composed his work from the original Paisāchī *Bṛihatkathā* or from one of its later Sanskṛit or Prakṛit renderings. Nevertheless it seems that Pratishṭhāna, the metropolis of the mighty Sātavāhanas, and Supratishṭhita, were two different cities.

10. *Supratishṭha-āhāra of the Vākāṭaka Records*

The confusion created by Somadeva is further worsened by the discovery of three Vākāṭaka copperplate charters that speak of a small territorial unit (*āhāra*) called Supratishṭha-*āhāra*. They are listed below.

1. *Puṇe Copperplates of Prabhāvatī Guptā*[14]

Though found at Puṇe, this charter was issued by the Vākāṭaka queen from Nandivardhana. The donated village Daṅguṇa was included in Supraṭishṭha-*āhāra*. The boundary villages were as follows:

a. Vilavaṇa to the east
b. Śīrshagrāma to the north
c. Kadāpiñjana to the west
d. Sīdivivaraka to the north.

2. The Jāmb Copperplates of Pravarasena II[15]

Issued on Āśvina śu. 12, in the second (regnal) year of the king Pravara Sena II, this charter was also issued from Nandivardhana. It purports to register the donation of a village called Kothurakagrāma with boundaries as follows:

a. The river Umā to the east

b. Chiñchāpallī to the south

c. Bonthikavāṭaka to the west

d. Maṇḍukigrāma to the north

3. The Wạdgāon Copperplates of Pravara Sena II[16]

This charter was issued from the royal camp on the banks of the river Hiraṇyā (*Hiraṇyā-nadī-vāsakāt)*, on Jyeshṭha śu.10, the (regnal) year 25. The donated village, Velusukagrāma, had the following boundary villages:

a. Gṛidhragrāma to the west

b. Kadambasara to the north

c. Nīlīgrāma to the east

d. Kokilāra to the south

All these villages were situated in the Supratishṭha-*āhāra.*

11. The Location of Supratishtha-āhāra

V.V. Mirashi has tried to locate these villages in the Hiṅganghāṭ tālukā of the Wardhā district. His identifications are given below:

1. The Puṇe Copperplates

a. The donated village Daṅguṇa=Hiṅganghāṭ

b. Vilavaṇaka=Vaṇi, 2½ miles to the east of Hiṅganghaṭ

c. Kadāpiñjana=Kadhājan 3 miles to the west of Hiṅganghāṭ

d. Sidivivaraka=not identified

e. Śīrshagrāma=not identified

2. The Jāmb Copperplates

a. The donated village Kothuraka not identified

b. The river Umā=The river Vunnā

c. Chiñchāpalli=Chincholī

d. Bonthika-vāṭaka=Bonthāḍ

e. Maṇḍukigrama=Maṇḍagāon

3. *The Waḍgāon Copperplates*

a. The donated village Velusuka=Chiṅchamaṇḍala

b. Gṛidhragrāma=Gaḍeghāṭ

c. Nīlīgrāma=Nilǰai

d. Kokilāra=not identified

e. Kadambasara=Kosara

V.V. Mirashi has identified Supratishṭhita-*nagara*, the headquarters of the Supratishṭhita-*āhāra* with Pothrā, a small village, 12 miles to the south-east of Hiṅghaṇghāṭ. Hiraṇyā river, according to him, is the modern Erāi river.

Yet another scholar has identified Supratishṭha-*nagara* with Pratishṭhāna itself and has tried to locate these villages in the (erstwhile) Aurangābād district.[18] But we maintain that his attempt lacks credibility.

The present supplicant feels that the determinant is the river Umā. V.V. Mirashi has identified this river with a small rivulet called Vunnā, flowing through the Hiṅganghāṭ tālukā. This identification is obviously wrong.

A river, now known as Umarāvatī, flows through the Sirpur and Sindkheḍe tālukās of the Dhuḷe district. The river Umā can safely be identified with the river Umarāvatī. Another river called Aruṇāvatī, which flows through these two tālukās, answers the name Hiraṇyā of the Waḍgāon copperplates. On the banks of the river Umarāvatī I could locate two tiny villages, Gidhaḍe and Kalamsare which can be identified with Gṛidhragrāma and Kadambasaraka respectively. These identifications are more likely than those proposed by V.V. Mirashi. So the modern Sirpur and Sindkeḍe tālukās of the Dhuḷe district can safely be identified with Supratishṭhita *āhāra*.

Again, the tradition goes that the insulted Guṇāḍhya repaired to Vindhyan region where he learned Paiśāchī from the Piśāchas.[19] The Sirpur-Sindhkheḍe tract is even today known as Bijāsana (Vindhyāsana).

Pratishṭhāna, the Sātāvāhana metropolis, cannot be identified with Supratishṭha-*āhāra* of the Vākāṭaka records as the Nandivardhana branch of the Vākāṭakas never ruled over the southern part of the Aurangābād district. Somadeva is not explicit on this point.

Kshemendra, in his *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī*, states that Guṇādhya was born at Pratishṭhāna, but he is also not lucid in his accounts.[20]

Notes and References

1. *Kathāsaritsāgara* Eds. J.S. Jha and P.C. Ojha, 2nd edition, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad, Patna, 1974, pp. 74ff.
2. *Śāradāśrama Vārshika,* Ed. Y.K. Deshpande, Yawatmal, Śaka 1855, pp. 30ff.
3. Please see paragraph no. 9.
4. Uddyotanasūri, *Kuvalayamālā*, Ed. A.N. Upadhye, Singhi Jaina Granthamala, Mumbai, 1959, p. 3.
5. Bāṇabhaṭṭa, *Harshacharita,* Ed. S.D. Gajendragadkar, published by A.B. Bapat, Puṇe, p. 5.
6. Dhanapāla, *Tilakamañjarī,* Nirnayasagar Press, Mumbai, 1903, p. 7.
7. Hemachandra, *Kāvyānuśāsana,* Jaina Grantha Prasarak Sabha, p. 61.
8. Hāla Sātavāhana, *Gathāsaptaśatī,* Ed. S.A. Joglekar, Prasad Prakashan, Pune, 1956, Gāthā no. 697, pp. 456-57.
9. Same as no. 1 p. 7.
10. Saṅghadāsagaṇi, *Vasudevahiṇḍi,* Vol. I, Jaina Atmānubhava Sabhā, Bhāvanagar, 1930.
11. *Mysore Archaeological Reports 1912,* pp. 35ff; *IA,* XLII, pp. 204ff; *JRAS,* 1913, pp. 309ff.
12. R.C. Majumdar, *Kambujadeśa,* pp. 70ff.
13. Same as no.1, p. 74.
14. *IA,* XLI (1913), pp. 214-15; *EI,* XV, pp. 40ff: Ajay Mitra Shastri, *Vākātakas: Sources* and *History,* Aryan Books International, New Delhi, 1997, pp. 9ff.
15. *Ibid.,* pp. 11ff.; *EI,* XXVI, pp. 155ff.
16. *Ibid.,* XXVII, pp. 74ff.
17. V.V. Mirashi, *Saṁsodhanah;* Ajay Mitra Shastri, *op. cit.,* pp. 29ff. *muktāvalī,* Vol.I, pp. 124-30.
18. *Bhāratīya Itihāsa Aṇi Saṁskṛitī,* (Marathi), Vol. 50, pp. 38-51.
19. Same as no. 1, p. 101.
20. *Bhārtīya Itihāsa Āṇī Saṁskṛitī,* Vol. 52, January 1970, p. 4.